

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, June 26, 2000
Volume 36—Number 25
Pages 1385–1468

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Signings

Arizona

Democratic National Committee luncheon
in Phoenix—1440

Departure for Phoenix—1432

Federal Victory Fund reception in
Phoenix—1437

California

Democratic National Committee dinner in
San Diego—1452

Reception for congressional candidate
Susan Davis in San Diego—1449

U.S. Olympic community in Chula Vista—
1458

Congressional Medal of Honor, presentation
to Asian-American heroes of World War
II—1418

District of Columbia College Access Act—
1413

Hillary 2000 dinner—1425

Irish-American Democrats, dinner honoring
Terence McAuliffe—1421

Medicare prescription drug coverage—1413,
1432

Morocco, state visit of King Mohamed VI
Dinner—1417

Welcoming ceremony—1412

New York, reception for Representative

Edolphus Towns in New York City—1388

Radio address—1391

Addresses and Remarks—Continued

Scripps Howard National Spelling Bee,
videotape remarks—1421

Texas

Democratic Senatorial Campaign
Committee

Dinner in Austin—1408

Luncheon in Houston—1399

Reception in Austin—1403

Southwest Voter Registration Education

Project reception in Houston—1395

Tobacco—1432

Bill Signings

Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000

Radio remarks—1415

Statement—1415

Communications to Congress

Energy, letter on national long-term needs—
1447

Iran, message transmitting report on national
emergency—1432

Kosovo International Security Force, letter
reporting on deployment of U.S. military
personnel as part—1387

Montreal Protocol, letter transmitting
amendment—1448

Russian Federation, message on national
emergency—1430

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

Editor's Note: The President was in Los Angeles, CA, on June 23, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Contents—Continued

Communications to Federal Agencies

- Fatherhood, memorandum on joint guidance supporting responsible efforts—1392
- Jerusalem Embassy Act, memorandum on suspension of limitations—1394
- U.S.-Israel Cooperation on Affordable Housing and Community Development, memorandum—1411
- Young people, memorandum on promoting health through physical activity and participation in sports—1464

Executive Orders

- Blocking Property of the Government of the Russian Federation Relating to the Disposition of Highly Enriched Uranium Extracted From Nuclear Weapons—1429
- Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Race, Sex, Color, National Origin, Disability, Religion, Age, Sexual Orientation, and Status as a Parent in Federally Conducted Education and Training Programs—1461

Interviews With the News Media

- Exchange with reporters in the South Portico—1432
- Interview with Rebecca Rankin of VH1—1385

Proclamations

- 50th Anniversary of the Korean War and National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day—1465

Statements by the President

- See also* Bill Signings
- Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms report—1421
- Death of former Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita of Japan—1417
- Ethiopia-Eritrea cease-fire agreement—1394
- European security and defense policy—1416
- Geneva Protocol, anniversary—1393
- Government meat inspectors, shootings—1447
- Greece, entry into Economic and Monetary Union—1407
- Gun laws, proposed legislation to bolster enforcement—1446
- House of Representatives action on tobacco legislation—1417
- North Korea, easing sanctions—1408
- School modernization, proposed legislation—1446
- Senate action on hate crimes legislation—1416
- Tobacco settlement lawsuit
 - Congressional action—1407
 - House of Representatives action—1465

Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—1467
- Checklist of White House press releases—1467
- Digest of other White House announcements—1466
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—1467

Week Ending Friday, June 23, 2000

**Interview With Rebecca Rankin of
VH1 in New York City**

June 16, 2000

“VH1 Save The Music”

Ms. Rankin. “VH1 Save The Music,” you’ve been involved for a while. When did you first hear about the program, and why did it draw you?

The President. Well, I’m trying to remember whether I first heard about it from my wife or whether I read something about it. But I actually wrote a letter to John Sykes because I was so excited about what they were doing. I had been in school music when I was a young person, starting at the age of 9. And I had been really, really upset about all these schools dropping their music programs when I was Governor. And Hillary and I redid the school standards in Arkansas. We tried very hard to protect the music programs and the arts programs and the physical education programs for the people who weren’t in team sports. And so I realized that all over the country these schools were under more and more financial pressure, and they thought that maybe the path of least resistance was just to get rid of the music programs. And so here was someone trying to do something about it. I was just thrilled, and I wanted to help.

Ms. Rankin. Very cool. Growing up—I know, I’ve watched a lot of tapes on you. We did “Rock and Roll President” a while back with you.

The President. Yes, in 1992. I loved it.

Ms. Rankin. Exactly. They gave me a copy of that. Music education was really important to you, obviously, growing up—

The President. Really important.

Ms. Rankin. —and music was really important. Looking at where you are now, arguably one of the most important people on the planet, what did music education do for you, and how has it come to play in your life now?

The President. Well, first of all, it gave me an outlet for all this energy I had. It gave me a constructive way to be creative. It also taught me discipline, and it taught me that to create something beautiful required hard work and discipline. It taught me how to be—to create alone, and also how to work with a group, in a band, a jazz band or a combo. And it made me happy. I mean, it just made me happy. It’s such a wonderful—when I was a kid and I’d have a tough time, as long as I could play, I could always be okay. I could just be in a private place. And it fueled my imagination. And it gave me an appreciation of things in life that has stayed with me to the present day.

I can still go in my music room that Hillary built me upstairs in the White House and play for 15 or 20 minutes, and all the cares of the world go away.

**Congressional Resolution on Music
Education**

Ms. Rankin. Very nice. So you guys have got to remember that when you’re playing. Mr. Clinton said it.

Let’s talk about, there was a resolution passed in Congress a few days ago, unanimous resolution saying that music education was extremely important. Why is it so important that this was passed, and what’s it going to do in the future?

The President. Well, I think it was important that it was passed because it shows that the Representatives of the people of both parties have now—are acknowledging that it’s important, and it’s a problem because there are so many schools that don’t offer it anymore. And I think it will tend to increase public awareness of this, public support for maintaining the music programs.

The President’s Advisory Commission on Music and the Arts did a study a couple of years ago, and Hillary was the honorary chair

of the committee. They found that local pressure, parental involvement, community involvement was the single most important factor in either keeping or restoring music programs to the schools. And so I think that's why it matters.

I think also, though, the Congress and the President have a responsibility to keep putting as much money out there to the schools to pay for their other expenses as possible—the buildings, the teachers to have smaller classes—so the schools will have the money they need for the music programs.

But, you know, there's lots and lots of research on this now which shows that if a good school music program increases academic performance, that a lot of young people learn in different ways and are dramatically stimulated by music. So that's another reason we ought to be for this. It actually will help the overall learning enterprise.

Ms. Rankin. Yes. That's an important point because I think everybody thinks of it as just an art, and it stops there—

The President. Not true.

“VH1 Save The Music”

Ms. Rankin. —and it's culture and it carries through.

We've had a lot of artists helping us this week with “VH1 Save The Music” week and the “Today Show.” Mariah Carey was out yesterday; A.J. McLean from the Backstreet Boys; the Goo Goo Dolls. Today we have Bon Jovi playing at the “Today Show” in Rockefeller Center. Are you a Bon Jovi fan?

The President. I love Bon Jovi. I really—I think he's great. I'm a music fan of his. I like his acting. He's doing very well in the movies now. And he's a marvelous young man. He's been to the White House to visit Hillary and me on several occasions. He's really—he's a very nice man. And I'm pleased for his success, and I'm grateful that he's helping today.

Ms. Rankin. What does it say to the public to have such important sort of star power behind a program like “VH1 Save The Music?”

The President. Well, I hope that it increases the public's awareness. I hope it says, hey, this is really important. I mean, these people could all be doing something else. And I hope it says to them, if all these people

who do music for a living think it's important for all our kids to have access to music, maybe it is.

Ms. Rankin. All right. These guys—do you go to this school, P.S. 96?

Audience members. Yes.

Ms. Rankin. All right, so the program and what's happening with the New York City school boards and public education, and music and what's going on here today—can you talk a little bit about what's being presented today and what's going to—

The President. Yes. If you look at these students here, VH1 has given them these instruments. So they're going to start a music program. Now, just a couple of years ago, this school had one of the worst performances in New York. And they've gone from having 80 percent of their kids not read at grade level to having three-quarters of their kids read at or above grade level in only 2 years. So they want this school to be one of the best schools in New York.

They have a school uniform policy, as you see, which is a very positive thing, I think. And now they want a music program. And what they know is not only will these children learn music and they'll enjoy it; it will further increase the academic performance of this school.

So I think they're all excited about it, and they're all proud of their school—aren't you?

Audience members. Yes.

Ms. Rankin. It's just kind of exciting to have President Clinton here, too, right? Oh, yes, just a little.

Audience member. An honor.

Ms. Rankin. An honor. A big honor.

One last thing. TV moments, music moments on television—what stands out in your mind as a huge one growing up, present day?

The President. When the Beatles were on Ed Sullivan. When Elvis Presley was on Ed Sullivan. I think those two things, when I was very young, made a big impression on me.

Ms. Rankin. Cool. All right. Thank you very much. I think you have to go back downstairs. So—[laughter]—these are things I can't see, but I think my 5 minutes are up.

Thank you so much. It was such an honor.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 8:40 a.m. in Classroom 200 at the Joseph C. Lanzetta School (Public

School 96) and was videotaped for later broadcast. In his remarks, the President referred to John Sykes, president, VH1. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders
Reporting on the Deployment of
United States Military Personnel as
Part of the Kosovo International
Security Force**

June 16, 2000

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

In my report to the Congress of December 15, 1999, I provided information on the deployment of combat-equipped U.S. military personnel as the U.S. contribution to the NATO-led security force (KFOR) in Kosovo. Additional U.S. personnel are also deployed in countries in the region and serve as support for our forces in Kosovo. I am providing this supplemental report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to help ensure that the Congress is kept fully informed on continued U.S. contributions in support of peacekeeping efforts in Kosovo.

The U.N. Security Council authorized member states to establish the international security presence in Kosovo in U.N. Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1244 of June 10, 1999, for an initial period of 12 months, to continue thereafter unless the Security Council decides otherwise. The mission of KFOR is to provide a military presence in order to deter renewed hostilities; verify and, if necessary, enforce the terms of the Military Technical Agreement (MTA) between NATO and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY); enforce the terms of the agreement of the former Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) to demilitarize and reintegrate itself into civil society; provide operational direction to the Kosovo Protection Corps; and maintain a safe and secure environment to facilitate the work of the U.N. Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) by providing, until UNMIK or appropriate local organizations assume these functions, for public safety and order and border monitoring.

Currently, the U.S. contribution to KFOR in Kosovo is approximately 7,500 U.S. mili-

tary personnel. This number once again will decrease to approximately 6,000 U.S. military personnel when ongoing troop rotations are completed. In the last 6 months, all 19 NATO nations and 20 others, including Russia and Ukraine, have provided military personnel and other support personnel to KFOR.

In Kosovo, the U.S. forces are assigned to a sector principally centered around Gnjilane in the eastern portion of Kosovo. For U.S. KFOR forces, as for KFOR generally, maintaining a safe and secure environment is the primary military task. United States forces conduct security patrols in urban areas and in the countryside throughout their sector. Approximately one-half of KFOR's total available personnel is directly committed to protection tasks, including protection of the ethnic minorities. The KFOR forces are under NATO command and control and rules of engagement.

In addition, other U.S. military personnel are deployed to other countries in the region to serve in administrative and logistics support roles for the U.S. forces in KFOR. Specifically, approximately 1,000 U.S. military personnel are operating in support of KFOR in Macedonia, Greece, and Albania.

Since my report to the Congress of December 15, in accordance with UNSCR 1244 and the MTA, FRY military, paramilitary, and police forces have not reentered Kosovo. The KLA agreed on June 21, 1999, to a cease fire, to withdraw from the zones of conflict in Kosovo, and to demilitarize itself. On September 20, 1999, KFOR Commander Lieutenant General Sir Mike Jackson accepted the KLA's certification that the KLA had completed its demilitarization in accordance with the June 21 agreement. The UNMIK thereafter established a civil emergency services entity known as the Kosovo Protection Corps that is intended to provide civic assistance in emergencies and other forms of humanitarian assistance.

The UNMIK has made progress in establishing an interim administration for the people of Kosovo. The KFOR, within its means and capabilities, is providing broad support to UNMIK. As UNMIK is still developing its structures in Kosovo, KFOR continues to

support UNMIK at all levels, including public administration, and is represented at the Kosovo Transitional Council and the Joint Civil Commissions. The KFOR personnel provide a security presence in towns, villages, and the countryside. Checkpoints and patrols are organized in key areas in Kosovo to provide security, resolve disputes, and help instill in the community a feeling of confidence. In addition, KFOR is helping to provide assistance in the areas of humanitarian relief, international civil police training, and the maintenance of civic works resources.

Ethnic tensions in Kosovo, however, remain a concern, particularly in areas where Kosovar Serbs and Kosovar Albanians live in close proximity.

NATO has planned for KFOR's mission to be formally reviewed at 6-month intervals with a view to progressively reducing the force's presence and, eventually, withdrawing. Over time, KFOR will incrementally transfer its security and policing responsibilities as appropriate to the international civil administration, local institutions, and other organizations.

I have taken these actions pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive. I appreciate the continued support of the Congress in these actions.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at a Reception for Representative Edolphus Towns in New York City

June 16, 2000

Well, thank you very much. I, too, want to thank LaDane and Ed Bergassi and the McGoverns for making this possible. And Bronx Borough President Freddy Ferrer, I'm delighted to see you in here. We've been friends a long time now. And I'm very glad to be here for Ed and Gwen. You know, he

was asking for that empowerment zone. I started to tell him, "Ed, that's what fund-raisers are, empowerment zones for politicians." [Laughter]

We also have Jim McManus here, who is the president of the Manhattan Democratic Club, thank you for coming; and a lot of other people who have been active in public affairs in New York a long time. Let me just say, I'm honored to be here for Ed. I like this guy, and he has been with me for a very long time. I just reminded him that in January of 1992, when I had been a candidate for President for about 3 months, 90 days, at a time when only my mother felt I could be elected—[laughter]—I spent Martin Luther King's birthday in his district going to Thomas Jefferson High School.

And I remember what it was like. There was the sense that these kids really weren't sure anybody cared about them. A young person had just been shot in the school a week before; the circumstances were heartbreaking and tragic. He took me there. He wanted me to see those kids. He wanted me to hear their stories. He wanted me to talk to the people. He thought it would be good for me, and he thought I needed to represent his people if I intended to be President. And I thought I needed to go.

Do you remember—at the time, I was terribly naive. President Bush was still referring to me as the Governor of a small, southern State. And I was so naive, I thought it was a compliment. [Laughter] Truth is, I still do. [Laughter] And what do you know? Now I'm a New Yorker—[laughter]—and I like that.

I want to thank you, Ed, for what you said about the empowerment zones. It's one of the things we did in our economic plan in 1993; it passed by one vote. As Vice President Gore says, whenever he votes, we win. So we had a tie vote. He broke the tie; we passed the economic plan. The deficit came down. Interest rates came down. The economy took off. The rest is history.

But one of the things that was in that economic plan—that, I might add, got no votes from the other party—was the provision for empowerment zones, to give incentives for

people to invest in poor areas and neighborhoods that weren't participating in the mainstream economy. I want to say more about that in a moment.

But tonight I want you to think about this election, just for a minute. Let's be serious just for a minute. I won't talk long, but I want you to think about it because somebody might ask you why you came here. And you ought to have an answer.

I think the election of 2000 is just as important as the elections of '96 and '92. It's hard for me to say, since it's the first time I won't be on the ballot in over 25 years. [Laughter] Why is that? Why do I believe that? Because I think what a country does with its great times can be as stern a test of its judgment and character as what a country does in the face of adversity.

You know, in '92, I'm very grateful—the State of New York gave me and Hillary and Al and Tipper Gore an enormous vote in '92, an even bigger one in '96, and I'm very gratified. But after all, the country was in trouble in '92. So people said, "Well, you know, maybe this kid is a Governor of a small, southern State, but we're in trouble. Let's take a chance."

Now, I've done everything I could for 7½ years to turn this country around, to move it in the right direction, to get the economy going, to build one America, to reach across the racial and other lines that divide us, to deal with the crime issue, the welfare issue, the environmental issue, the health care issue, to do these things seriously, to make America a good friend and neighbor to the rest of the world.

So what are we going to do with the longest expansion in history? What are we going to do with the first 3 years of back-to-back surpluses in anybody's memory? What are we going to do with the virtual certainty that we'll have surpluses for another 10 or 15 years now? What do you want to do with that? That's really what this election is all about.

And the person who wins the Presidency and the party that wins the House and makes progress in the Senate races will depend upon what the American people think the election is about. Very often the answer to a question depends on what the question is.

Now, what I think we ought to be doing is saying, "Hey, this won't last forever, and we're not going to blow it; we're going to make the most of it, to build the future of our dreams for our children. We're going to take on the big problems that are still out there. We're going to seize the biggest opportunity that is there before us. We're going to do big, important things." That's what I think we ought to do.

I think we ought to make a commitment to keep the economy going, to keep paying down the debt, and to give economic opportunity to all the neighborhoods that have been left behind. That's what my new markets initiative is all about. I want to give people like you, who can afford to come to this fundraiser, the same financial incentives to invest in poor areas in America we give you to invest in poor areas in Latin America and Africa and Asia today.

I think we ought to make a commitment to eliminate poverty among children in working families, and to do more to help families balance work and family, with child care and with health care initiatives that working people can afford for their families. I think we ought to do more to guarantee excellence in education to all of our kids and access to college to everybody who gets out of high school. That's what I think. You may not agree with any of this. You have to decide.

I think we ought to do more to roll back the tide of climate change—it's going to change life for New Yorkers dramatically in the next 30 years if we don't do it for all America—and to prove that you can keep cleaning up the environment and growing the economy. I think we ought to do more to build one America across all the lines that divide us. I think we ought to pass hate crimes legislation. I think we ought to pass employment and nondiscrimination legislation. I think that we ought to do these things.

I think we ought to do more to be a force for peace and freedom and decency around the world. I don't think we ought to make the U.N. practically beg us just to pay our dues that we owe. We're honored to have the U.N. It's headquartered in New York. We get a lot out of it. It's a great source of prestige for our country. Every time the

U.N. sends a peacekeeping mission somewhere, it's a place we don't have to send American soldiers. And I think it's awful that some in our Congress act like they're doing the world a favor when they pay what we owe to the United Nations. That's what I think. And I think we ought to be a better partner and look for more opportunities to work with and through other people in the years ahead. But you've got to decide what you think.

I think we ought to do more to meet the challenge of the aging of America. I'm the oldest baby boomer. When all of us baby boomers retire, there will only be two people working—[laughter]—for every one person on Social Security. Now, there will be more than two people working—[laughter]—but there will only be two people working for every one person on Social Security. So what are we going to do?

Well, we can have more people on Social Security working; that's why we lifted the earnings limit on Social Security this year—a good thing we all did together, with the Republicans and the Democrats.

I think we ought to preserve Medicare and add a prescription drug benefit. If we started a Medicare program today for seniors, we would never have one without drugs—ever. But in 1965, when Medicare was established, being old was a very different thing. First of all, everybody who lives to be 65 in America today has got a life expectancy of 83. Some of you younger people here, who are still having children, will give birth to children whose life expectancy, once we decode the human gene, will be nearly 100.

And I think when we know that pharmaceuticals more and more will keep us alive, let us live longer and let us live better, to have a Medicare program without a program that is affordable for all of our seniors I think is crazy. So I think it's a big deal. Now, that's what I think it's about.

The other point I want to make to you is, there are big differences between the parties—legitimate. Second point, all the Republicans opposed my economic plan in '93. They said it would be bad. Well, 22 million jobs later, and we've got the longest economic expansion in history. This is not an argument. We were right, and they were

wrong. Now, their argument is, "Okay, we've got a good economy; let's go give all this money away in a big tax cut again."

You have to decide. It's very appealing. You might think this thing is so strong, nobody can mess it up, and you'd like to have the extra cash. Our position is harder to take. Our position is, we want a tax cut, but not as big as theirs because we think we still need money to educate our kids, and we think we need money to meet our other commitments, and we think we ought to keep paying this debt down. We're for a minimum wage; they're against it. We think we ought to have a more aggressive environmental program; they think we ought to relax our environmental efforts. There are real differences.

We think we ought to do more to help the cities; by and large, they disagree. The only area where we've got just a chance to have a bipartisan agreement is to give incentives for people who invest in the poor areas of urban and rural America, and I'm hoping and praying we get it. There are big differences.

So number one, mistakes are high. Number two, there are big differences. Here is the third, most important point: They hope you won't think there are very big differences on election day. So there's a lot of nice talk and kind of bumping and hugging going along here in these elections.

For example, there was a big story in the press today about how the Republicans had hired pollsters to teach them how to talk about the importance of providing prescription drugs, to teach them the words—say, you know, "We could lose the Congress over this, because we're not really for giving all these seniors prescription drugs." So they hired pollsters to tell them the words to say to convince you that they are for it. And they're nice words. I would like to say some of those words. I have said some of those words.

But there is a big difference. They don't believe that all seniors should get the help. They believe that we should subsidize, with tax money, insurance policies that even the insurance companies—I've got to give them this; I fought with them for 7 years—but even the health insurance companies say they

cannot offer policies at affordable prices that real people will buy.

So the Republican plan does not offer our seniors a chance to get prescription drug coverage—like he wants—Ed Towns—badly.

Now, you need to think about this. I mean, you're here for him, and we couldn't beat him with a stick of dynamite with this one. But it's important that you understand that every one of these elections matters. And I'm not on the ballot. I've done everything I could do to turn this country around.

I talked to a gentleman the other day who said, for a lame duck, I was still quacking pretty loudly. [*Laughter*] I'm doing all I know to do. But I want you to think about this.

I want you to remember, number one, we've got the chance of a lifetime; what are we going to do with it? I think we ought to be dealing with the big issues, big opportunities, big challenges. Number two, there are real differences between the two parties—honest—we don't have to say anything bad about the Republicans. I don't like all this. They're just differences. But number three, they hope you won't understand how deep those differences are, because most folks agree with us.

Now, those are the things I want you to remember. So if somebody asks you how come you came, say, "I like Ed Towns; he's been a good Congressman. He's fighting to deal with the things that we ought to deal with, and I'm determined not to blow the greatest chance America has ever had to build the future of our dreams for our children. And I know there are differences, and I'm going to go vote based on what I think is right."

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:15 p.m. at Trump Towers. In his remarks, he referred to event co-chairs LaDane Williamson, Ed Bergassi, and Kevin and Lisa McGovern; James R. McManus, district leader, McManus Midtown Democratic Association; and Representative Towns' wife, Gwendolyn. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

June 17, 2000

Good morning. Tomorrow America pauses to honor the countless contributions and obligations of fatherhood. When I think back on all the titles I've held—from attorney general of Arkansas to Governor to President—none of them comes close in importance and in fulfillment to the simple title of father.

Fatherhood is one of the great blessings of life and also one of the greatest challenges any man can have, especially at a time when it's becoming more and more difficult to balance the pressures of work and family.

Today I want to share some evidence with you about the critical role fathers play in their children's lives, and I want to talk about our obligation as a nation to help more fathers provide both the emotional and the financial support their children need.

We've known for a long time now that students do better in school and later in life when their parents are more actively involved in their learning. But over the years, parent involvement often has meant mothers' involvement. This assumption misses the importance of fathers. Research now confirms that involvement of both parents in a child's education makes a positive difference, and that father involvement during infancy and early childhood also contributes to a child's emotional security and enhances problem-solving in math and verbal skills.

In fact, one study showed that the chances of a child getting mostly A's increased by over 40 percent in two-parent families where the father was highly involved. Even in families where the father isn't living with his child but remains actively involved, those odds of getting A's increased by a full third.

Clearly, fathers matter when it comes to early childhood development and education. And while there is now a growing understanding of that fact, it was Vice President Al Gore who put a national spotlight on this issue during his 1994 Family Reunion Conference, and he's worked tirelessly on it ever since.

Our combined efforts are paying off. I'm pleased to release a report today from the

Departments of Education and Health and Human Services that offers educators and early childhood providers information, strategies, and tools to successfully involve more fathers in their children's learning—from encouraging more fathers to read with their kids at home to inviting more of them to volunteer in schools and child care centers.

The report highlights model programs around the country and provides resource information for practitioners. We also know that noncustodial parents who continue to be involved with their children are more likely to pay child support. The sad fact is that one in three children in America today lives without his or her father. They shouldn't be punished, either emotionally or financially, because of that. That's why for 7½ years now we've made child support enforcement a top priority.

And today we've got some further evidence that our efforts are paying off. Child support collections increased 10 percent during the past year, reaching a record of nearly \$16 billion. That's double what it was in 1992. This means fewer women on welfare, fewer children in poverty, more families living in dignity.

When it comes to protecting children and building strong families and strong communities, all of us have a role to play. But first and foremost, it's about caring mothers and fathers; and then about supporting community. But Government also must do its part. And we mustn't forget that most fathers out there really do want to do a good job. That's why today I'm also directing a number of departments to develop coordinated, interagency guidance to help States and communities identify and use available Federal resources and opportunities for promoting responsible fatherhood.

The research and the results are clear: supporting, responsible fatherhood is good for children, good for families, good for our Nation. It's why we propose building on our progress with a \$255 million responsible fatherhood initiative called "Fathers Work/Families Win." The fact is, many fathers can't provide financial and emotional support to their children, not because they're deadbeat, but because they're dead-broke.

Our initiative would help at least 40,000 more low income fathers work and support their children. Unfortunately, in the spending bill passed in the House this week, the Congress turned its back on this challenge by not including any money for this important initiative. So I ask Congress to work with me across party lines to pass a budget that makes sure more fathers can live up to their responsibility. Working together, we can help fathers better fulfill the emotional, educational, and financial needs of their children.

As we prepare to celebrate the first Father's Day of the new century, let's do all we can to help more fathers live up to that title, not just through their financial support, but also by becoming more active, loving participants in their children's lives.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 11:15 a.m. on June 16 in Classroom 230 at Joseph C. Lanzetta School (Public School 96) in New York City for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on June 17. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 16 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast.

Memorandum on Joint Guidance on Supporting Responsible Fatherhood Efforts

June 16, 2000

Memorandum for the Attorney General, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Education

Subject: Joint Guidance on Supporting Responsible Fatherhood Efforts

One of the fundamental goals of my Administration has been to strengthen fathers' involvement in their children's lives. In support of that goal, I directed all executive departments and agencies to review their policies, programs, and initiatives to ensure that they supported men in their role as fathers. The review concluded that the Federal Government can play an important role by providing coordinated guidance and resources

that support responsible fatherhood to individuals and State and local governments.

Under the leadership of Vice President Gore, my Administration has made significant progress in promoting greater father involvement, within the Federal workforce as well as through Federal programs and resources, and through partnerships with States and communities, foundations, and the research community.

As you know, my Budget for Fiscal Year 2001 substantially expands our efforts to promote responsible fatherhood and strengthen families. The Budget proposes \$255 million for the first year of a new "Fathers Work/Families Win" initiative to promote responsible fatherhood and support working families, allows States to simplify child support distribution rules, provides incentives to States that pass through more child support payments directly to families, and extends Welfare-to-Work grants to help noncustodial parents move into lasting unsubsidized jobs. In addition, my Budget proposes to increase the Earned Income Tax Credit by nearly \$24 billion over 10 years, providing an additional work incentive of as much as \$1,200 in tax relief to an estimated 6.8 million hard-working mothers and fathers.

Recent research indicates that promoting and rewarding work for low-income families can support marital stability, increase employment and earnings, reduce domestic violence, and improve children's behavior and school performance. In addition, research confirms that child support is an important factor in lifting children out of poverty. There is also evidence that a large proportion of unmarried fathers are involved with their children at birth, but that these relationships tend to weaken over time. And employed fathers are more likely to be able to support their children financially and emotionally.

These results, as well as the 1995 review, show the importance of providing Federal guidance and resources to States that can support responsible fatherhood, work, and family. Therefore, I direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in conjunction with the Secretaries of Labor, Agriculture, Education, Housing and Urban Development, and the Attorney General, to develop and provide, within 90 days of the date of

this memorandum, coordinated guidance on Federal resources and opportunities for promoting responsible fatherhood.

This guidance should:

- (1) clearly identify existing resources available, including Federal welfare reform block grant funds, Welfare-to-Work and workforce development resources, educational resources, paternity establishment and child support, Food Stamp Employment and Training, and low-income housing and community development funds;
- (2) help States, local governments, community- and faith-based organizations, fatherhood practitioners, and families, identify and use Federal resources and opportunities to strengthen the many roles of fathers in families;
- (3) clarify the extent to which existing policies and practices, including child support policies, can be modified to help ensure available resources effectively serve lower-income fathers;
- (4) identify opportunities to build on and sustain the involvement of fathers in low-income, unmarried parent, "fragile families"; and
- (5) list contact information to help interested parties access information on a regular basis.

This guidance should be accessible, and made available through the websites of Federal agencies, as well as in printed form.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 16 but was embargoed for release until 10:06 a.m. on June 17. An original was not available for verification of the content of this memorandum.

Statement on the Anniversary of the Geneva Protocol of 1925

June 17, 2000

Seventy-five years ago today, June 17, 1925, the international community took a major step toward protecting the world from the dangers of weapons of mass destruction by concluding the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

In the aftermath of the terrible casualties caused by poison gas in World War I, the Geneva Protocol banned the use in war of chemical and biological weapons.

More recently, the international community has worked to build on this achievement. The 1972 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) banned the development, production, and possession of biological and toxin weapons, and the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) did the same for chemical weapons. Today, 135 countries are parties to the CWC, and 143 are parties to the BWC. The United States has ratified both agreements, and our commitment to them has enjoyed strong bipartisan support.

Today, one of the greatest threats to American and global security is the danger that adversary nations or terrorist groups will obtain and use chemical or biological weapons. The international agreements we have reached banning these weapons are a critical component of our effort to protect against this threat.

In my 1998 State of the Union Address, I called on the international community to strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention with a new international inspection system to help detect and deter cheating. Significant progress has been made in Geneva at the Ad Hoc Group of BWC States Parties toward achieving this goal. We urge all participants in this process to work toward the earliest possible conclusion of a BWC Protocol that will further strengthen international security.

On this 75th anniversary of the Geneva Protocol, I call on the countries of the world who have not yet done so to join the Geneva Protocol, CWC, and BWC. I call on all parties to strictly adhere to these agreements and to work to strengthen them. It is more urgent than ever that, true to the words of the Geneva Protocol, their prohibitions “shall be universally accepted . . . binding alike the conscience and the practice of nations.”

Statement on the Ethiopia-Eritrea Cease-Fire Agreement

June 18, 2000

Today in Algiers, Ethiopia and Eritrea signed an agreement to cease hostilities. This

is a breakthrough which can and should end the tragic conflict in the Horn of Africa. It can and should permit these two countries to realize their potential in peace, instead of squandering it in war.

I commend the Organization of African Unity, and especially its chair, Algerian President Abdelaziz Bouteflika, for leading the negotiation of this agreement. I am grateful to my envoy, former National Security Adviser Anthony Lake, to Assistant Secretary of State Susan Rice, and to my senior adviser on African affairs, Gayle Smith, for their tireless pursuit of a peaceful resolution to this conflict. The United States has supported the OAU in this effort, and we will continue to do so. I have asked Tony Lake to return to Algiers to work with the OAU as we enter the next round of negotiations.

I hope this commitment by Ethiopia and Eritrea to stop the fighting also signals their commitment to build the peace. I urge them to use the next round of talks to produce a final, comprehensive, lasting agreement, so they can get on with the work of pursuing democracy and development for their people. Ethiopia and Eritrea are America's friends. If they are ready to take the next step, we and our partners in the international community will walk with them.

Memorandum on Suspension of Limitations Under the Jerusalem Embassy Act

June 16, 2000

Presidential Determination No. 2000-24

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Suspension of Limitations Under the Jerusalem Embassy Act

Pursuant to the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including section 7(a) of the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-45) (the “Act”), I hereby determine that it is necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States to suspend for a period of 6 months the limitations set forth in sections 3(b) and 7(b) of the Act.

You are hereby authorized and directed to transmit this determination to the Congress,

accompanied by a report in accordance with section 7(a) of the Act, and to publish the determination in the *Federal Register*.

This suspension shall take effect after transmission of this determination and report to the Congress.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., June 21, 2000]

NOTE: This memorandum was published in the *Federal Register* on June 22 and was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 19.

**Remarks at a Southwest Voter
Registration Education Project
Reception in Houston, Texas**

June 19, 2000

Thank you very, very much. Well, I think Representative Noriega did his family proud, don't you? I thought it was great. Thank you. [Applause]

I would like to thank all of you who are here, including the folks behind me: my good friend Bill White; and my long-time friend Representative Al Edwards; and Carlos Truan, whom I've known for nearly 30 years. And Antonio Gonzalez, thank you very much. And Billie Carr is still working her cell phone after all these years. [Laughter] Tell whoever it is I said hello, Billie. [Laughter] I love this.

I want to thank Representative Sheila Jackson Lee for being here. And Mickey Ibarra, who is my special assistant, who works with State and local government around the country; I thank him for coming down here, along with Steve Ricchetti, my Deputy Chief of Staff.

I'm delighted to be with Southwest Voter Registration Project, and I want to thank you for all the work that you have done with me and the Vice President over the years, the work you have done to advance democracy, to bring Latino voters into the process, to promote education and economic development.

I also appreciate the solidarity you have shown with others who also deserve to be empowered and to have a full portion of the American dream. And I want to acknowledge, again, Representative Al Edwards, who

is here, because today is June 19th, which is known in the African-American community in the South as "Juneteenth." It's the holiday that celebrates the emancipation of the slaves in Texas.

And for those of you who don't know, basically, Abraham Lincoln, in what is now the Lincoln Bedroom, signed the Emancipation Proclamation in September of 1862. It became effective January 1, 1863. But most of the slaves who were freed did not find out until after the Civil War, because the proclamation ran to the States that had seceded. And formal notice came on June 19th, in Texas, and it became known as Juneteenth. In the western part of the southern States, it's still not uncommon to see these "Juneteenth" celebrations all across the South, particularly in little towns who have family ties going back to that period. And Al made it a holiday in Texas. We congratulate him. Thank you, old friend.

And let me sort of pivot off of that to say that this day should be a day for rejoicing but also for reflection, and for reminding ourselves that there's still a lot of hardship out there and still a lot of discrimination against people because of their race or their sexual orientation or something else that makes them different, and therefore makes other people afraid of them, or believe that they can look down on them and do things that aren't right.

On the way in here, I met with Louvon Harris and Darrell Verrett, the sister and the nephew of James Byrd. They're right here. Stand up. [Applause] It was 2 years ago this month that James Byrd was killed here in Texas, in a heinous act that shocked Americans in every corner of the country, including all the good people of Texas. It reminds us that crimes that are motivated by hate really are fundamentally different and, I believe, should be treated differently under the law.

In the Federal Government we have Federal hate crimes legislation on the books that I believe should be stronger. But we have prosecuted a number of the cases. We have substantially increased the number of FBI agents working them; we have formed local hate crimes working groups; and for 3 years we've tried to pass a stronger Federal bill

and to support similar actions in States across the country.

I know you were disappointed when the State hate crimes legislation didn't pass here. But I am pleased to be able to tell you that the United States Senate has finally agreed, the leadership of the Senate, to allow a vote, up or down, on hate crimes legislation that has now been held up since November of 1997,* when I had the first White House Conference on Hate Crimes. But it's now going to be voted on.

And I want to tell you about it. The bill has been strengthened. The version of the bill that is now going to be voted on will be introduced by Senator Kennedy today on the Senate floor. It strengthens the Federal hate crimes legislation and also gives State and local officials more Federal resources to help to prosecute these crimes.

Now, we believe that most hate crimes should be prosecuted—investigated and prosecuted by State and local officials, with the Federal Government being a partner. But too often Federal officials have literally been prevented from teaming up with local law enforcement, and that has kept communities from being able to do what needed to be done to work these offenses.

Senator Kennedy's bill takes steps to change that by giving State and local officials the assistance they need. It also requires the Attorney General to confer with them before bringing a case in Federal court. So we have actually strengthened the original bill, put some more resources in it, and done it in a way that I hope and pray will get us enough Republican votes to actually pass the bill. And I ask all of you to stand with this fine family. They've been out here working for this for 2 years now. They have worked through their grief and through their pain. They've been willing to stand up and be counted.

And we have a chance now to pass this at the Federal level. And I know that Representative Sheila Jackson Lee cares very deeply about this. I brought two United States Senators down to Texas with me today, Ron Wyden and Bob Torricelli, who are profoundly committed to it. And I just want to

ask you to help us. You have shown your solidarity on all these human rights issues. We have people here from the Human Rights Campaign Fund in this room today. I want to ask you to help us. We've got a chance now. We have to pass this legislation.

I'd like to mention one or two other things, if I might. Congress, I hope, will pass some legislation to correct two long-standing injustices that affect immigrants in our country. First, we need to amend our immigration laws to provide equitable treatment for all Central American immigrants. In that connection, we should give migrants with long-standing ties to our country the chance to legalize their status.

As all of you know, we had a huge amount of turmoil in Central America right through the 1980's, into the early nineties. The Federal law actually discriminates against Central Americans who came here for the same reasons, depending on what country they came from and what the nature of the conflict was back home. And I don't think any of us think that is right. And a lot of these folks have been here a long time. They've established families. They've married people from other countries or from our country. They've got kids in our schools, and we need to do this.

The third thing I'd like to ask your help on is to continue working with us to see that our Federal courts reflect America's growing diversity. *[Applause]* I appreciate you clapping, but I want you to really help us do something about this.

Representative Noriega said that I had appointed and nominated the most diverse group of Federal judges in history. We've appointed more Hispanic-Americans to the Federal bench than any administration before. Twenty-four of my judicial appointees have been Hispanic-Americans, more than the previous two Republican administrations combined. I'm proud of that. But—yes, but—*[laughter]*—and the “but” is important, several imminently qualified minority nominees have become casualties of a highly politicized confirmation process.

Let me back up and say that, generally, if you—there have been lots and lots of scholarly articles pointing out that my nominees are the most highly regarded by the

* White House correction.

American Bar Association professional evaluation in 40 years, that they have by and large not been political, that they have not been on one ideological extreme; they have been mainstream appointees. And they have constantly been attacked in the Senate, because they didn't fit the ideological mold that the Republican majority wanted.

For example, Ricardo Morado, my candidate for the Southern District here in Texas, his nomination has been put on hold. Kathleen McCree Lewis in Detroit—her father, Wade McCree, was one of the two or three most important lawyers in the entire civil rights movement, highly regarded lawyer. Never been an African-American woman on the Court of Appeals there. Can't get a hearing for her.

And perhaps the most egregious case in the entire country, I think, is the case of Enrique Moreno, who I nominated to the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. He has been waiting more than 275 days, without even receiving a judiciary committee hearing. And last month Senator Gramm and Senator Hutchison said they were going to oppose his nomination because he wasn't qualified. They said he wasn't experienced. Well, you be the judge. From humble beginnings in El Paso, he established, first of all, an utterly brilliant academic career—I might add, more brilliant than that of virtually everyone who'd be voting on his confirmation. *[Laughter]*

The State judges in Texas said he was one of the top three trial attorneys in El Paso. The American Bar Association gave him their highest rating—not just a good rating, their highest rating. But this State's Republican Senator said he's not qualified. And apparently, everybody else is going along with it because there's been no voice to the contrary. Now, I don't know about you, but if he's not qualified, who is?

This is the kind of thing—we've been going through this—I can give you lots of other examples. The first African-American ever to serve on the Missouri Supreme Court was defeated in the Senate by a blatant partisan misrepresentation of his record. And we can't have this kind of thing in our country.

It wasn't as if I said, "Well, I want a quota here, and I'm going to appoint this guy because he's Hispanic." This guy has a brilliant

academic record, a brilliant record as a lawyer. The American Bar Association says they give him their highest rating. And the Senators here say he's not qualified. And this is part of a distinctive pattern.

This should not be partisan. I went out of my way because we'd had 20 years of partisan fights in judgeships. I went out of my way to try to pick people that would not raise partisan hackles, to be totally bipartisan in this. And in spite of that, because there are those in the other party who see the courts as an instrument of partisan policy and want it to be that—not because I've made it there but because neutral is not good enough, fair is not good enough, unbiased is not good enough—that's what's going on here. And if you feel strongly about it, you better be heard.

And the device is always to deny these people a hearing or to deny them a vote. Why? Because they don't want them on the court, but they don't want the people you're trying to register to vote to know they don't want them on the court. Right? So the answer is, blur everything, shift, kind of just sort of waver around here, and let it all die and hope nobody will know what really happened.

So I'm here to tell you this is a good man. If he was involved with me politically, I don't know it. Maybe that's—I don't. I appointed him because the people came to me and said we've got a chance to appoint a guy who's superbly qualified, who can get the highest ABA rating and be a good thing for Texas, a good thing for the Fifth Circuit, and so I did it. And I think for him to be denied, not because he's political, but because he's not political enough in the right way, is wrong.

Now, let me just say a couple of things in closing. We've got to get everybody to vote in this election, and then they need to know what the stakes are. You want people to register to vote and to make intelligent choices. And I think we're actually quite fortunate in this millennial election, because we don't have to engage in a kind of personal, negative histrionics. I think you've got two good people running for President who have profound disagreements. But it's important people know what the differences are. I think you've got good people running for the Senate all

over America, and running for the House. There's one Senate race I'm especially interested in. *[Laughter]*

But anyway, you've got all these good people. We don't have to run an election where anybody badmouths anybody else. Just everybody stand up and say where they disagree, and let the voters make up their mind.

But it is important not to think that there are no disagreements and that there aren't any consequences, because there are. Just because we have a bunch of good people doesn't mean there are no consequences to the decisions the voters will make. So people have to make up their mind. And first, they have to register, then they have to vote. And when they go, they need to actually have a clear view of, if I vote for this set of candidates, this is what I get, these are the decisions I get, this is the direction I get; if I vote for this section, this group, this is what I get.

And I've done everything I could to try to turn the country around. And I'm very proud of the fact that we're paying down the debt instead of running it up, that we've got the longest economic expansion in history and over 22 million jobs and the lowest Hispanic unemployment rate ever recorded and the lowest poverty rate in 20 years and the highest Hispanic homeownership and 2½ times as many SBA loans and all that.

But the truth is, all that matters is, what are we going to do with it? What is it that you propose to do with it? I'm glad we had a successful empowerment zone in south Texas. I'm glad that we've been able to do these things.

But the issue is, what are you going to do with it? What should the economic policy of the country be? Should we continue paying down the debt and protecting Social Security and Medicare and investing in education? Or should we give all the projected surplus back to you in a tax cut and just hope that we won't run a deficit and hope somehow we'll find the money to invest in education?

What should we do in education? Should we modernize our schools and make sure we hire enough teachers and identify schools that aren't succeeding and turn them around, or change the leadership? Or should we adopt a voucher program and say that public

schools probably can't be made to work, so let's go to a voucher system?

I was in a school in New York City this week—let me just give you one example, one example. Two years ago Public School 96, in Spanish Harlem—2 years ago, 80 percent of those kids in this grade school were reading below grade level—2 years ago. Today, 74 percent of them are reading at or above grade level, and doing math at or above level—in 2 years.

I was in a school in Kentucky the other day that was one of the worst performing schools in the State—elementary schools. There were 5 percent of the kids reading at or above grade level 4 years ago; today, 57 percent of them are. There were 12 percent of the kids doing math at or above grade level; today, 70 percent are. There were zero percent of the kids doing science at or above grade level; today, two-thirds are—basically, in 3 years. It's the 19th best elementary school in the State of Kentucky. And way over half the kids are on free or reduced school lunches.

So what I want you to know is that without regard to income or background, intelligence is equally distributed, and schools can be made to work if we just do what we know works. And that's what I think we ought to make a commitment to do. You know, when I started this school reform business 20 years ago in Arkansas, when I was trying to do it, we didn't really know what worked. But we do now. And it would be a terrible mistake for us to turn away from what works toward something that we don't have any idea whether it works or not but would drain a lot of money off—I think.

What about the economy? Well, I think it's important that we do more to bring the benefits of the economy to people and places that haven't fully participated. That's why I want to increase the earned-income tax credit, something you helped me do before—lifted over a million Hispanics out of poverty in the years that I've been in office. That's why I think we ought to raise the minimum wage again.

That's why I think we ought to adopt this new markets initiative. It's the only really good bipartisan thing we've got going up in Washington now. We are working really well

in the House in a bipartisan way. It's really quite touching, and I thank the Speaker of the House for doing it. And I hope we can do it in the Senate. It's why I think we ought to implement a lot of the recommendations of the Southwest Border Initiative Task Force that I got. A lot of you have been involved in that in one way or the other.

What are we going to do about health care? Are we going to have a Patients' Bill of Rights or not? Are we going to let all the seniors on Medicare have access to affordable prescription drugs or not? Are we going to do more to let working families have access to affordable health insurance or not? I've got a big proposal on that. I think Houston has one of the highest percentages of working people without access to health insurance in the entire United States—a lot of them Latino. This is a big issue.

So that's the last thing I leave you with. The country is moving in the right direction. Things are better than they were 8 years ago. But how a nation deals with its prosperity is as stern a test of its character and judgment as how it deals with adversity. And those of us that are old enough to remember different times know that nothing lasts forever. And when you're in the bad times, you can thank God for that. But when you're in great times, you should be humble and grateful and make up your mind to make the most of them.

We've got the best chance in my lifetime to deal with the big challenges still out there, to seize the big opportunities out there. And that's why it's important that you empower people. They can't take good times for granted. And if they're still in trouble, they shouldn't take that for granted, either. The vote is the voice, just like your sign says.

And it's been a great honor for me to serve. It's been a great honor for me to work with you. I've had the time of my life. This is the first election in 25 years I'm not part of; most days I'm okay about it. *[Laughter]* But as a noncandidate, the only thing I ask everybody to do is to vote and to be intelligent about it, to make up your mind what you think we ought to do with this moment of prosperity, and then to clearly understand the choices before you and go out and make yours. If we do that, America will be in good hands.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:35 a.m. in the Austin Room at the Four Seasons Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Texas State Representatives Rick Noriega and Al Edwards; Bill White, former chair, and Billie Carr, executive council member, Texas State Democratic Party; Texas State Senator Carlos F. Truan; Antonio Gonzalez, president, Southwest Voter Registration Education Project.

Remarks at a Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Luncheon in Houston

June 19, 2000

Thank you very much. Senator Torricelli, Senator Wyden, Mayor Lanier and Elise, and Secretary Bentsen and B.A.; Mr. White, we miss you in the administration. I told Lloyd Bentsen when he and B.A. came through the line, I said, "Well, your economy is still humming along pretty good, Lloyd." And I want all of you to know that if he hadn't been my first Treasury Secretary, might not any of us be sitting here today celebrating the strongest economy in American history, and I thank you very much.

I am here today primarily on behalf of our Democratic candidates for the Senate and those who are presently serving. I suppose that every American who is a reasonably good citizen understands, in general, what the Senate does, and thinks on balance it would be a good thing if good people were there who more or less agree with you.

But because of the unique vantage point that I have occupied in the last 7½ years, I probably feel that more passionately than any other person. I know what a difference it makes in the confirmation process of judges, in the weighing of the decisions about confirming people for other important positions, and how legislation is shaped and how the whole direction of foreign policy is controlled. And these things are very important. And I think what I would like to do today, recognizing that, as all of you know, I have a special interest in one particular Senate race—which, thank goodness, does not disqualify me from speaking here today. *[Laughter]*

I want to leave you with three thoughts. Somebody's liable to ask you why you showed

up here today. And you need to be able to give an answer. And the three points I want to make is, number one, this is a big election. And it's just as important as the elections of 1992 and 1996, which enabled us to turn this country around and move it in the right direction and get a lot going.

The second thing I want to say is, there are real differences between the candidates of the two parties. And I hope this will be an immensely positive election. It is no longer necessary for us to engage in the politics of personal destruction. I hope we've beat that back for a long time to come. But that means you can have an honest debate on the real differences. And from the White House to the Senate to the House, there are real differences. And we ought to have a good time debating them—in a good humor, be happy our country's in good shape, and just have an old-fashioned citizenship lesson in what the differences are. So it's a big election; there are real differences.

The third point, however, I want you to know is that for the only time, I think, in my adult lifetime, one party—the Republican Party—doesn't really want you to understand what the differences are. Which is a dead giveaway that, at least, they think if the American people knew what the differences were, they'd vote with us. And from my perspective, I'm—first, let me say I'm grateful that I had the chance to serve as President and determined to get everything done I can do in the next 6 months, 7 months I have to serve. I had a very distinguished man call me a couple of days ago, and he said, "You know, Mr. President, for a lame duck, you're still quacking rather loudly." *[Laughter]* So I do think there's a lot that we're going to get done in the next 6 months.

But what I want to say to you is I've done what I could to turn the country around, to build that bridge to the 21st century, to bring people involved—all different kinds of people in the political process. My Deputy Chief of Staff, Steve Ricchetti, is here—look around this room, he said—and Steve grew up in Ohio, and he looked at me, and he said, "This is not your typical Texas cowboy crowd, is it?" And I said, "You know, Texas has changed. Houston has changed. America

has changed. This is a different world out there. And we want everybody involved."

And so what I hope for my country now is that we will say to ourselves, this is a very important election; here's what we want to accomplish; here's where the candidates stand, from the White House to the Senate to the House; here's what we're going to do. I mean, I hope that democracy, in short, will work the way it's supposed to work. And then none of us can have any complaints.

But a lot of people seem to think it really doesn't make much difference because the economy is so prosperous; we've got the longest economic expansion in history and the 22 million new jobs and the lowest African-American, Hispanic unemployment rate we ever had, the lowest crime rate in a quarter century, and the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years—they're half what they were when I took office. And there is no apparent threat to our security, and our country is able to be a force for peace and freedom around the world. So they say, could there be any differences? And the answer is, yes. Are there consequences? Yes.

Anybody who has lived more than 25 or 30 years, anyway, knows that nothing lasts forever. Now, if you're in the middle of a terrible time, that's immensely reassuring. *[Laughter]* But if you're in the middle of good times, it ought to be humbling and sobering. You get a time like this maybe once in a lifetime as a nation, where you really have it within your power to shape the future of your dreams for your children.

And to do that you have to ask, what are the great challenges; what are the great opportunities here before us? And then, how should we go about meeting them? And I think you can really argue that how we handle prosperity is as stern a test of our judgment, our vision, our character, as how we handle adversity. There is not anybody in here over a certain age who can't remember at least one time in your life when you made a mistake, not because things were going so badly but because things were going so well. You thought there were no consequences to the failure to concentrate. It's just part of human nature.

So that's the first thing. This is a big, big election. The second thing is, what are the

questions? Bob Torricelli said I always try to ask the right question. I think that the outcome of these elections will be determined, in no small measure, by what people think the question is. So I can only tell you what I think the big questions are.

Number one, how do we keep the economy going? It's projected that we're going to have a very large surplus over the next 12 years—10 years. We can actually get this country out of debt in the next 12 years. Should we do it, or not? I think we should. And we can do that, still have a decent-size tax cut, invest in the education of our children, invest in science and technology, and health care and preserving the environment and keep paying the debt down.

And in the process, we will then prepare for what I think the next big challenge is, the aging of America. How are we going to handle it when there are only two people working for every one person drawing Social Security and Medicare? We should be saving today against that eventuality and preparing for it.

How are we going to extend this economic prosperity to people in places who have been left behind? Now this is something Vice President Gore and I have worked on very hard for the last 8 years. We have this empowerment zone program that he's done a brilliant job of running. We've got one quite successful one down in south Texas, which is now the third fastest growing area of America—interestingly enough, Secretary Bentsen's backyard down there.

But I think we ought to give Americans the same incentives to invest in poor areas here we give them to invest in poor areas around the world, in Latin America or Africa or Asia. And I'm working with the Speaker of the House. I'm trying to make this a totally bipartisan issue. But this is a big deal, because there are still a lot of people in places who aren't part of this prosperity.

The next big question—I think a big ethical question for our society—how are we going to permit people to do a better job of balancing their responsibilities as parents and their responsibilities at work? A higher and higher percentage of people with young children are in the work force. If they have to choose between succeeding at raising their

children and succeeding in the work force, society has lost from the beginning. Because the most important work of all is raising children. And so, obviously, if you make people choose, we're going to lose. There's a lot more we can do there.

We have an enormous percentage of families who are racked with worry because they don't have access to health insurance. Houston, the greater Houston area, one of the highest percentages in the country of working families who don't have access to health insurance—what do we propose to do with that?

How are we going to grow the economy and continue to improve the environment and deal with the challenge of global warming, which now virtually everybody acknowledges is real? Can it be done? The answer to that is, yes, it can be. How are we going to give all of our kids a world-class education and open the doors of college and university to everybody? How are we going to stay on the cutting edge of science and technology? How are we going to continue to be a force for peace?

Now, what are the specifics here? Are there differences? Yeah. The Democrats, for example, believe that America should ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty—we're trying to get India and Pakistan to do it—the Republicans don't. They believe we should walk away from a generation of leading the world toward less dangers from nuclear weapons. This is a huge issue, and it falls right on the Senate.

So if you agree with them, that you think it would be a good idea if America withdrew from all these global arms control regimes and stop trying to reduce the danger of nuclear weapons and say, "We'll just have bigger weapons; we don't care what anybody else does"—then you should support the Republicans for the Senate. But if you are proud of the fact that America has tried to lead the world away from the nuclear brink and reduce the nuclear threat, and that we—you should be, I hope, proud of the fact that I was the first world leader to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and you would like to see it ratified—then you should support the Democrats.

I'll give you just another. If you believe that we should pay down the debt and have a modest tax cut we can afford, and that we can't possibly assume we're going to have all this money that people now say we'll have over the next decade, so we should take a more prudent course, then you have to vote for our side. If you think that it's an absolute lock-cinch that nothing bad will happen in the next decade and you want to get all the money out there right now in a tax cut and just hope to goodness it will all work out all right, you should vote for them. Because that's what they want to do, and they really believe it.

They don't believe there's any way anything bad can go wrong, and so they want to spend the surplus right now, all of it, before it materializes. And they think it will make the economy stronger. I think it will cause interest rates to go up. I think it will bring back the deficits, and I think it will make it weaker. But you have to decide. It's not like you don't have a choice here. And I could go through issue after issue after issue.

Now obviously, you've made your choice or you wouldn't be here. But the point I'm making is, you need to go out across the State, across the community, across the country, to your friends, and say, whether you agree with me or not, this is an important election. The country is being tested. This is the election where we will say, "This is what we propose to do with our prosperity." That's what this election is about.

Nineteen ninety-two was about, "We're in a mess here; how are we going to get out of it?" Nineteen ninety-six was about, "Can we really build a bridge to the new century by keeping this going?" Two thousand is about, "What do we propose to do with our prosperity?" And then I want you to say, "There are differences between the candidates at all levels, and it is not necessary, as we too often have done in the last 20 years, to criticize them personally. It is better to say, here are their honest differences." And then, of course, I hope you'll—[applause]. Thank you.

And then, of course, I hope you'll say why you agree with our side. But even if someone disagrees with you, that's what an election

is about. That's what democracy is supposed to be.

And this is the last point I want to make. The most important thing of all, which is why I like looking around this crowd today, is that we find a way to live together with all of our differences, that we find a way not just to tolerate them but to celebrate them, to say we are glad these Muslims from South Asia are part of 21st century America. We think they look very nice in their garb, and they're probably more comfortable than we are in the summertime. And we might have something to learn from them about the way life is organized and lived and thought about. And who knows, maybe they've got something to learn from us.

And this makes us stronger, that we have Sikhs and maybe Hindus and we've got Jews and we've got Christians and we've got Bahais and we've got people from every different racial and ethnic group.

And there has to be a way for us to celebrate this and, yet, reaffirm the primary importance of our common, shared humanity. Everything I have done as President for 7½ years, when you strip away all the details of the policy, has been designed to achieve that.

If I could have one wish for America, I would wish for us to be one America in that sense, because we're very smart. We're very industrious. We're very clever, and we'd figure out how to solve all our other problems. If we can keep the human heart in proper balance as we relate to others, we're going to be okay. And one of the things I'm proudest about my party and my Senate candidates is that that's the America we believe in.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:17 p.m. in Salon A at the Four Seasons Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Senator Robert G. Torricelli, chair, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; former Mayor Bob Lanier of Houston and his wife, Elise; former Secretary of the Treasury Lloyd Bentsen and his wife, Beryl Ann (B.A.); and Bill White, former chair, Texas State Democratic Party.

**Remarks at a Democratic Senatorial
Campaign Committee Reception in
Austin, Texas**

June 19, 2000

I'm glad to see this place in the daytime. [Laughter] Well, first, I want to thank Roy and Mary for letting me come back to their home. I love this place. And it's exhibit A for the proposition that if you want to live like a Republican, you should vote Democrat. [Laughter]

Mr. Benson, thanks for the music. And I want to thank Governor Richards for being here, because now I know I'll get at least one new joke before I get on the plane tonight to go home. [Laughter] And Governor Briscoe, thank you, sir, and thanks for being so nice to Hillary all these years. And my good friend Jake Pickle, I miss you, and I'm delighted to see you.

I want to say to all of you who had anything to do with this, I'm very grateful. I was looking tonight at Roy and Judy and Garry Mauro, and we all started out together 28 years ago. They don't have any gray hair; I'm practically broken down. [Laughter] I don't know how this happened. But Mauro and Spence and I, we were 30 percent of the white male vote McGovern got in Texas. [Laughter] We could dominate the whole—it was kind of a kick; it was the ultimate case of being a big fish in a small pond. That's not quite fair, there's several of you in here I met 28 years ago. And I've loved my relationships with this State and with these people a long time.

And I want to thank Senator Torricelli for all the hard work he's done for the Democrats in the Senate. And Senator Wyden, thank you for coming all the way from Oregon.

And my great long-time friend Chuck Robb, who in many ways would qualify for the title of the bravest person in the Senate. He's the guy that always stands up and votes exactly what he thinks is right and to heck with the consequences, and then goes out and really believes he can convince the people of Virginia he's right. He had to run for reelection against Ollie North in 1994, the worst year the Democrats have had in 40 years. And he survived. And now he's got to

run against a man who's a very popular former Governor, and he's going to win again. And he's going to win again because he's brave and good, and you should be very proud of him and his Texas size. And I thank you very much.

Now, I also want to thank those of you who helped Hillary when she was down here. She was also here with us in Texas in 1972, and I just talked to her before I came here. And she spoke to the Merchant Marine Academy commencement on Long Island today. And she was regaling me with tales of the merchant marine—it made me want to join again. I wish I was 20 years old, and I could start—when you said, “I was your 28-year-old friend,” I thought, you know, if somebody would let me be 28, I'd let them be President, and take my chances. [Laughter] I could do it again. I'd take my chances. I'd do it all over again. [Laughter]

Let me—I'll be brief. I always wonder whether I'm preaching to the saved at these meetings. But I want to say just a couple of words here. First of all, I'm grateful for the chance I've had to serve, and I've loved it. Secondly, I've had a good team. And I say this, and I want to say a little more about this in a minute, but there's never been, in the history of America—and I'm a pretty good student of American history—a Vice President who's had remotely the positive impact on this country as Vice President than Al Gore has had. I've had a great Cabinet; I've had a great staff. My wife has played a marvelous role in a lot of different ways in helping move the country forward. And we've had a good time. And lo and behold, it worked out pretty well.

And what I would like to say—I'd just like to make a couple of points, because somebody might ask you tomorrow why you came, and I don't want you to say you just wanted to see Roy's house one more time. [Laughter] A lot of the things that happened that were good, I think, happened because we had a set of ideas about how the country should be run and how we should work. That is much more like your work in your daily lives than the way Washington worked when I got there and the way, unfortunately, it still works too much today.

I basically believe that there was something wrong when you had a political system where everybody said, "It's just terrible; we're up to our ears in debt," and then kept voting to run the debt up every year. I thought there was something wrong with a system that said that if you were pro-labor, you couldn't be pro-business; if you wanted a clean environment, you couldn't be pro-growth; and that the Republicans and the Democrats just spend all their time trading insults instead of figuring out how to get work done. Because I can tell you—and I think we're going to get a lot of stuff done in the 7 months I've got left to be President. And if we do everything we could conceivably get done, as the Senators here will tell you, there will still be plenty that we disagree about in the election.

And so we began to work on getting the economy together and on trying to figure out how to pull people together to actually solve problems. And we had an economic strategy that said, get the debt down; invest more in education, even if you have to cut out a lot of other things the Government is doing, and in science and technology; figure out a way to deal with a lot of these big, long-term challenges; and try to pull the country together across all the lines that divide us, because we're growing ever more diverse.

Steve Ricchetti is here with me. He's my Deputy Chief of Staff. He grew up in Ohio. We went to Houston; we were at a lunch in Houston today. We had Muslims, Sikhs, east Asians, obviously, African-Americans, Hispanics, the old rednecks like me there. It was an amazing thing. Ricchetti looked around this crowd, he said, "This is not your typical Houston cowboy crowd, is it?" [Laughter] And I said, "No, but it's tomorrow's Texas." It is tomorrow's Texas, and it's tomorrow's America. So it's working.

Now, I think the way elections come out often depend on what people think the question is. So what do you think the issue is in this election, in the President's race, in the Congress races, in the Senate and the House? I think it is, what are we going to do with this moment of prosperity? Eight years ago the country took a chance on me, but we were in trouble. Everybody felt like we were in trouble. They thought we were

drifting; they thought there was too much fighting going on; they thought we needed to take a new direction. And they decided to take a chance on us.

So now we've got the ship of state turned around. We've got the longest economic expansion in history, the lowest crime rate in a quarter century, the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years, the relative absence of crisis at home and abroad. Our country has been a real force for peace and freedom throughout the world. So what are we going to do with it?

And if you think that's the question, then you have to answer it. My belief is, since I'm now old enough to remember the last time we had the longest economic expansion in history, is that we've got to work like crazy to deal with the big challenges and seize the big opportunities our country has, because nothing lasts forever. If you've been through any tough times in your life, you thank God it doesn't last forever. But nothing lasts forever. The world is not static; it's changing very rapidly. And we have this little moment in time, and we can make something really big and beautiful and wonderful out of it.

I've done everything I could to leave this country in good shape. And my only desire now is that when I'm not President anymore, that everybody is trying to make the most of it, instead of just squandering it.

So, for me, what does that mean? It means we ought to keep the economy going. We ought to extend its benefits to everybody that's willing to work for it. We ought to help families meet the challenge of the new world, like how to balance work and child rearing. And we ought to think about the major issues of the future: putting a human face on the global economy; expanding trade and lifting people's lives; dealing with this problem of climate change, which the young people here may find to be one of the three biggest problems they'll face in the next 20 to 30 years unless we face it now. How are we going to deal with all this diversity at home? Unless we can deal with it at home, we can't really, over the long run, deal with all the problems around the world. It's a big deal. How are we going to deal with the aging of America?

So, number one, I think this election is as important as the ones in '92 and '96. It's

just different. And I think it ought to be about, what are we going to do with our prosperity, first one. Number two, this does not have to be one of these elections—and we've had all too many over the last 20 years—where the candidates just try to bludgeon each other about, you know, this one's a crook, and this one's no good, and all this kind of stuff. We don't need any politics of personal destruction here. We just need an honest debate on the honest differences.

But pointing out the differences is not negative; it's healthy. You've got to understand, there are choices, and all your choices have consequences, whether it's in the Presidential race, the Senate races, or the House race. And so, point one, it's an important election; point two, there are big differences.

Point three—and this is very important; you watch this—the most interesting thing about this election is, only the Democrats want you to know what the differences are. [Laughter] It's very interesting this year. And I suppose I should take that as a compliment. [Laughter]

But, I can tell you, if you just go through—let me just—and this is why the Senate's so important. And you know, everybody that has studied civics 101 knows that the Congress is important. But I think no one—I think maybe a President understands more than anyone else how profoundly important it is, every single Senate seat. They vote on who goes on the Supreme Court—big deal, huge consequences in the next election.

There will be two to four new members of the Supreme Court in the next 4 years. They vote on treaties. They vote on other important appointments. And the way their system works, one Senator can virtually either shut the whole show down or change the whole future of the country, for good or ill. And unless you've actually been there and seen it, you can minimize it.

So I'll just give you a few examples. And again, I feel this way about the President's race. I think we ought to say, okay, we got two good people here; there's no point in running anybody down; they have real differences; here they are; here are the consequences of your decision. Just don't pretend that there aren't any consequences, and be willing to live with them, whichever you

do. Because there's a lot of surveys which show that, notwithstanding people's tendency to believe that all of us politicians never keep our word, that most Presidents pretty much do what they say. And when they don't, we're glad they didn't. Like Abraham Lincoln promised not to free the slaves. Franklin Roosevelt said he'd balance the budget, and with 25 percent of the people out of work, it would have been the worst thing he could have possibly done.

But people normally do what they say they're going to do when they run for the Senate, when they run for the House, and when they run for President. Now in the Senate—I'll just give you a couple of examples. We're going to face a big question early next year. And I'm battling the preliminaries now. You'll see the skirmishes unfolding over the next 7 months.

What's the best way to keep the economy going? Our side says, the best way to keep the economy going—when there's so much growth and unemployment is so low, when everybody is looking at inflation, the Federal Reserve has already raised interest rates—the best thing we can do is keep paying this debt down to keep interest rates as low as possible.

We can afford a reasonable tax cut that helps people educate their kids, pay for child care expenses, gives people with money the same incentives to invest in poor areas in America we now give you to invest in poor areas in Latin America and Asia and Africa. But we've got to have a—there's got to be a limit to it, because we've got to keep paying the debt down and because we've got to save enough money to deal with Social Security and Medicare when the baby boomers retire.

The Republicans believe that because the estimates of the surplus are so large over the next 10 years, we should go ahead and plan to spend it all on a tax cut and the other commitments that have been made. Well, it would be self-serving for me to say that the surplus would materialize, because it happened on my watch. But I don't really believe you can bank on \$2 trillion showing up over the next 10 years. There are lots of turns in the road between here and there. So I think we're right, and I don't think they are.

But you have to make a decision. And the Senate elections will have a lot to do with that. I'll give you another example.

We're going to be more and more involved with the rest of the world, whether we like it or not. I'm trying to pass this bill to normalize trade relations with China. I think it's very important. I think it may keep us out of another war in east Asia in the 21st century. It's important. It's more important than the money involved, to me, and it's a good economic deal for us—is that we fought three wars in Asia in the last 50 years, and I don't want my kids or my grandkids to be involved in one in the next 50 if there's anything I can do to help it.

It's not a guarantee, but we'll dramatically increase the chances of a peaceful future if we have a constructive relationship and try to bring Chinese society into a rule-based, law-abiding, get-along-with-your-neighbors, try-to-find-some-way-to-work-it-out system.

So what are the differences there? Well, I've worked real hard to work with other countries to reduce the threat of nuclear, chemical, and biological war. I was the first world leader to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The Republicans voted it down—the first time an arms treaty has been voted down, an international treaty like that, since the Republican Senate voted against the League of Nations in 1919. And Governor Bush said he agreed with that.

They just don't believe that. They think we don't have to be part of that; we should just take care of our own defense, and if we've got to keep testing—if 25 other countries start nuclear tests, that's okay. So we have big differences there. And you have to decide whether you think the Democratic Senators are right or the Republican Senators are right.

And it could have real consequences for how these children have to live. And you should hear their argument. I think they're wrong, but they can tell you why they think it's time for us to change 50 years of our efforts to work with others to reduce the arms issue.

On climate change, I think that it's finally possible in this high-tech age, that Austin is one of the centers of, to grow the economy and reduce damage to the environment. Ba-

sically, most of the folks in their party don't believe that. They still think if you want to get rich and stay rich, you've got to put more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. You need to decide whether you think they're right or we're right.

And I could just go through issue after issue after issue. On health care, we're for the Patients' Bill of Rights, they're not. We want a Medicare program that has prescription drugs that seniors can buy, because I think if we were creating Medicare again today, we'd never have a Medicare program without a drug component. Thirty-five years ago, it was about hospitals and doctors; now it's about keeping people out of the hospital. Anybody who lives to be 65 today has a life expectancy of 82. These children here have got a better than 50 percent chance of living to be 90, once the human genome is completely mapped. And you see all of these things are going to come forward.

You have to just decide. And they have their arguments. They say, "Well, it might cost too much." My argument is, it won't cost near as much as giving the surplus away on a tax cut. But you ought to listen to them. But I'm just telling you, I think that—the thing that bothers me is that things are going along so well in the country, people might be too casual about this election. And what you do with the good times is as stern a test of your judgment, your vision, and maybe even our national character, as what we do in adversity. And there are real differences with real consequences.

Obviously, I think a lot of these ideas have been tested, and we turned out to be right. We're in this huge fight over what I think is self-evident. I don't think I'm going to keep anybody out of the deer woods by passing legislation that says if a crook tries to buy a gun at a gun show, we ought to have time to do a background check and stop the crook from getting the gun. That's what we did with the Brady bill. Half a million criminals didn't get guns. We've got the lowest gun crime in a decade or 20 years; dropped 35 percent since I've been in office, hasn't been a single hunter missed a day in the woods.

And every time I say this, oh, they all squalled, and Charlton Heston—looks like I'm trying to end the American way of life.

[*Laughter*] And the Republicans agree with them, and the Democrats in the Senate basically agree with me. And I come from a—I had my first .22 when I was 12. But I think there's evidence here, in the lower crime rate and the less violence, and I don't think this country is safe enough. But I just want you to remember that.

It's a big election, just as important as '92 and '96. I think the question is, what are we going to do with our prosperity? There are real differences with real consequences. But only one party really wants you to know what the differences are. I think that's a pretty good argument for our side.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:53 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to reception hosts Roy M. Spence, Jr., and his wife, Mary; musician Ray Benson; former Governors Ann Richards and Dolph Briscoe, Jr., of Texas; former Representative J. J. (Jake) Pickle; former Texas Land Commissioner Garry Mauro and his wife, Judith; Gov. George W. Bush of Texas; U.S. Senatorial candidate George Allen; and Charlton Heston, president, National Rifle Association.

Statement on Congressional Action on the Tobacco Settlement Lawsuit

June 19, 2000

Last year the Department of Justice filed a civil lawsuit against the tobacco companies to recover the billions of dollars the Federal Government spends each year on tobacco-related health care costs. Tobacco-caused diseases kill more than 400,000 Americans each year and cost billions in health care costs, including more than \$20 billion in Federal payments under Medicare and other programs. The Justice Department's suit would simply hold the tobacco industry financially responsible for reimbursement of these costs.

The suit is based on overwhelming evidence, much of it from the tobacco industry's own documents. This evidence shows that the tobacco companies have conspired over the past 50 years to defraud and mislead the

American public and to conceal information about the effects of smoking.

The Congress, in its appropriations bills, is undermining this lawsuit by preventing the agencies that have been harmed and that could recover billions—the Defense Department, the Veterans Administration, and the Department of Health and Human Services—from providing any support. If Congress cuts off funding for this lawsuit or interferes with the Justice Department's pursuit of the lawsuit, Congress will be capitulating to the tobacco industry once again at the expense of taxpayers and their children.

It would be wrong for Congress to undermine the authority of the Department of Justice and block this lawsuit rather than allow it to be decided on its merits in court. I call on Congress to support rather than undermine these efforts and allow the Justice Department to keep working to give taxpayers their day in court.

Statement on Greece's Entry Into the Economic and Monetary Union

June 19, 2000

I congratulate Prime Minister Simitis and the Greek people on the decision today at the EU Summit in Portugal to bring Greece into the EU's Economic and Monetary Union (EMU), effective January 1, 2001. Reaching agreement to become a full member of the EMU a year before the euro currency is introduced demonstrates Greece's remarkable economic progress in recent years. This economic success complements Greece's increasingly active political role within the EU.

Through determination and hard work, Greece succeeded in meeting all the Maastricht Treaty economic criteria. Entry into the EMU is not the end of the race but the start of a challenging new phase of economic reform. We wish the Hellenic Republic every success as it moves ahead and hope this will usher in a new era of increased trade and investment between our two nations.

Statement on Easing Sanctions Against North Korea

June 19, 2000

Since last September, when I announced the measures being implemented today to ease sanctions against North Korea, North Korea has maintained its moratorium on missile tests. These measures are supported by our close allies in the region and are part of the process of close coordination between the United States, Japan, and South Korea recommended by former Secretary of Defense William Perry. We will continue to build on these efforts and on the recent North-South summit to achieve additional progress in addressing our common proliferation concerns.

Remarks at a Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Dinner in Austin

June 19, 2000

Thank you. I feel—first of all, I feel a little sorry for all of you. You have to look at me, and I'm looking at all this, behind you. *[Laughter]*

I want to thank Lynn and Tom for making us feel so welcome in this beautiful, beautiful place. And I want to thank them and Ben and Melanie and everyone else who worked on this dinner tonight, for its success. I want to thank Roy and Mary Spence, who hosted me earlier, for the Democratic Senate candidates and for what they did.

Thank you, Mayor Watson; we're glad to be here. Thank you, Governor Richards. Thank you, Garry Mauro. Thank you, Liz Carpenter, my old friend. Thank you, B. and Audrey Rapoport; and Dan Morales and John Sharp. Thank you, all. And I'd like to say a special word of thanks to Luci Johnson and, through her, to her mother and her entire family for what they have meant to the United States.

And I want to thank Lyle Lovett for being a good Democrat and a good friend to me, and always being there when I've needed him over the years. He made me think that even on my bad-hair days, I could still be

President. *[Laughter]* That was probably the last song he'll ever sing for me. *[Laughter]*

I also want to tell you how much I admire and appreciate the work that I've had the chance to do with Tom Daschle and Bob Torricelli and Chuck Robb and Pat Leahy and Ron Wyden. We really do have a big percentage—over 10 percent of our caucus here tonight. And maybe Ann is right; maybe it's because Texas needs Senators, and we need money, but for whatever reason, they're here. And I hope you'll take advantage of it.

Let me say, as is usually the case when I get up to speak, everything that needs to be said has already been said, but not everyone has said it. *[Laughter]* But I'd like to just make a comment or two, if I might.

First of all, I've had a lot of friends here in Texas, and especially in Austin. And as I look back on the last 7½ years and I look forward to the next, approximately, 7 months I have to serve, I would just like to say, thank you. Thank you for your help. Thank you for staying with us. Thank you for giving me and Al Gore and Hillary and Tipper and our entire administration the chance to do what we've done for the last 7½ years. I've had a wonderful time doing it, and I am very grateful that the results turned out to be pretty good for you, as well as for us. It's been a joy.

Now, I also want to say to you that I thought a lot back in 1992 about what I would like America to be like in 2000, if I should be fortunate enough to be elected and to be reelected. And I believe that one of the reasons that we had some success is that I'd worked as a Governor for a dozen years, through very difficult economic times. I had had a chance to try to come to grips with the major economic and educational and other challenges of the day. And I had a pretty clear idea about what I wanted to do if I got elected. And it turned out that the ideas that I and many others who worked with me over a decade developed worked pretty well.

I say that to make this point. I'm glad that we've got the longest economic expansion in history. I'm very glad that we have the lowest minority unemployment rate ever recorded. I am profoundly grateful that we have a 20-

year low in poverty and a 40-year low in female unemployment and a 32-year low in the welfare rates and a 25-year low in the crime rate. I'm glad the country is at peace and America has been a force for peace and freedom throughout the world. But the question I want to ask you is, what do you intend to do with it?

Our host mentioned the great work that President Johnson and the Congress did 30 years ago-plus, with the civil rights legislation. I would like to remind you that 1961 to 1969 was, until this period, the longest economic expansion in American history. And with that expansion, we got not only the civil rights legislation under of President Johnson, we got Federal aid to education, and we got Medicare, among other things.

So what I want to ask you again is, to me, this election for the Senate and the House and the Presidency will be determined largely by what people think it's about, because times are good and the candidates are presentable, to say the least, from top to bottom. So who you're for depends in large measure on what you think the election is about.

And I just want to make three points tonight, briefly. Number one, this is a big deal. This election is every bit as important as the elections of '92 and '96. Why? Because I've done everything I could to turn this country around and move it in the right direction. And now we have the chance to build the future of our dreams for our children.

But what a country does with its prosperity is sometimes just as stern a test of its judgment, its wisdom, and its character as what a country does when its back is against the wall. There is not a person here tonight over 30 years old who cannot recall at least one time in your life when you made some sort of a mistake, a personal or a business mistake, not because things were going so badly, but because things were going so well, you thought you did not have to concentrate.

And one of the things that you learn as you get older is that nothing ever lasts. And for those of us that have been through a few tough times, we say thank God for that. But when you're going through these good times, it's well to be humble and not to engage in too much self-congratulation and not to break your concentration. So I will say again,

I think this election will be determined by what the American people think it is about.

And I believe it should be about building the future of our dreams for our children. I believe it should be about what we propose to do with our prosperity. And if you start from that premise, then you have to say, well, what do you think we ought to do with it?

I think the most important thing we can do is to keep it going and spread its benefits to the people and places that still aren't part of it. I think we need to make sure that all of our families have a chance to make the most of it. That means we have educational and health care and environmental challenges we need to meet. I think it's important that we continue to keep our eyes on the future and not be satisfied with where we are. I'm glad we've got a crime rate that's at a 25-year low; I think we ought to make America the safest big country in the world. I'm glad the air and the water are cleaner. I think we ought to turn back the tide of global warming. I'm glad that more people than ever are going to college. I think we ought to open the doors to every child who is qualified to go to college, and money should never be a bar to anybody going ever again.

Then, if you think that's the subject, then the second point I want to make to you is this. It's an important election; it ought to be about what we're going to do with our prosperity. Point number two, there are real and profound differences between the parties. This does not have to be an election where, like all too many in the past, we see one exercise after another in character assassination, where you think you don't really have a campaign unless you can convince the people that your opponent is just one step above being a bank robber. That is not true.

You can start with the Presidency and go to the Senate races and the House races and say, "You know, we've got perfectly presentable candidates here, but there are real differences." That's my second point. It's a big election; there are real differences.

Now, here's my third point. We're the only party who wants you to know what the differences are. [Laughter] And I suppose I should take that as a great compliment. But you need to understand, and you need to talk

to people. That's why these Senators are here. You wouldn't be here if you didn't understand that. But there are profound consequences. The next President is going to appoint somewhere between two and four Justices of the Supreme Court. And both of them bring commitments to the Presidency about those appointments. And they are different. And the Congress will have to ratify or reject those decisions—the Senate, alone. That's just one example.

I'll give you another example. I was the first leader of any nation in the world to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, a dream of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy and President Johnson. Every President for the last 50 years has longed for the day when we could ban nuclear testing, so we could keep other countries from becoming nuclear powers. And it now happens at a time when our own experts tell us, because of those of you in the high-tech business who are involved in weapons, we can simulate testing, and we don't have to test anymore.

So banning nuclear testing makes the world a lot safer place. That's what I believe. The Republican Senate voted against the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. They made us the only major country in the world to reject the Test Ban Treaty—America, alone. Everybody else said it's the right thing to do—except India and Pakistan haven't come along yet, and I went over there to try to stop a conflict that could go into a nuclear war, pleading with them to stop it, when our own Senate said, "Oh, let's go on and test. Who cares?"

Now, this affects the lives your children are going to lead. In the future, you're going to have to worry about, when I'm long gone, not just the United States and Russia, but whether terrorists in other states are going to use the tools of modern technology, which make everything smaller, to bring many weapons of mass destruction—nuclear, chemical, and biological—around. I think we missed a terrific opportunity not to lead the world toward a safer place. We turned around and walked away from 50 years of Republican and Democratic history. And we better reverse it. We ought to ratify the Test Ban Treaty. Your decisions on the White

House and the Senate will determine whether we do. And you need to make up your—*[inaudible]*.

I'll give you a few other examples. We're for a comprehensive Patients' Bill of Rights. Some of us—I'm strongly supportive of the right kind of managed care, but I think that the patients ought to come first. They're against the Patients' Bill of Rights. We believe we ought to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare that all of our seniors can afford and have a chance to buy. They don't favor that. I could just go on and on and on.

We believe we ought to tackle the problem of climate change. Some of their Members still think it's some sort of subversive plot to wreck the American economy. In the digital economy, much of which is represented on this porch tonight, it is now no longer necessary to put more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere around Austin, Texas, for people to grow wealthier. In fact, for the first time in history we can grow wealthier by improving the environment instead of polluting it. That's what we believe. They don't agree with us about that.

Now, you may think that's a pretty esoteric subject. I don't. The children in this audience tonight will find in 20 to 30 years that will be one of the two or three most important issues they have to face, unless we turn it around right now. It's a big issue. There are consequences in this election.

On the matter of public safety, I think you all know that I am not the favorite person of Charlton Heston or his executive director, Wayne LaPierre. *[Laughter]* But all they can do is shout generalities, because there hasn't been a single hunter miss a day in the deer woods because of me in 7½ years. *[Laughter]* I listened to all that when I signed the Brady bill, when I signed the assault weapons ban.

And now, we believe that there should be no guns around children, that don't have trigger locks. We believe that large ammunition clips ought not to be imported into America to evade our assault weapons ban. We believe that a crook shouldn't be able to get a gun at a gun show that the crook can't get at the gun store without a background check.

Now, these are not radical things, but what I want to tell you—this is an interesting argument, because it's not like there's no evidence here. The same crowd that's against this told me 7 years ago, when I signed the Brady bill, that all it would do is inconvenience legitimate gun owners and be a terrible burden, and it wouldn't help anything. Well, a half a million felons, fugitives, and stalkers later who didn't get handguns because of what the Brady bill required in the background check, we have a 35 percent decline in gun crime. And, I'll say again, not a single Texas hunter has missed a day in the deer woods. They are wrong about this, and there's a difference about this.

And I don't care how low the crime rate has gone; anybody that thinks this country is safe enough has not spent enough time where the crime rate is high. We ought to keep going until this is the safest big country in the world. We owe it to our kids.

We think—I'll just say one other thing. I believe that one of the reasons America has done so well is that our prosperity has been broadly shared, that we've had over 22 million new jobs, that we've got the lowest minority unemployment rate among Hispanics and African-Americans ever recorded. We favor raising the minimum wage because we need it, and they don't. We favor dramatically increasing what's called the earned-income tax credit, which is an income tax refund to poor working people with children, especially those with three or more kids, and they don't.

Now, this is not negative. You should listen to them and let them tell you why they're against what we're for. But we should not be under any illusions that there are no consequences to this election. If you want the prosperity to continue, you should know that there are two different approaches. If you want us to be sure we can guarantee excellence in education to every young person, you should know there are two different approaches. If you want working people to have a chance to succeed at work and raising their kids, whether they work at one of your wonderful companies or whether they work in this hot weather serving your food tonight, there are two different approaches.

And so I say, all I can ask you to do between now and the election is to help our

people, but talk to other people. And don't let the American people—I don't mean just here in Austin or in Texas, but I mean all over the country where you have friends—people must understand. All I want to know is that when I walk out the door on January 20th, the American people took this election seriously. They understood that we turned this country around, that we had the chance of a lifetime, that there were differences, and they understood what the differences were. And in their own heart and mind, they voted to build the future of our dreams for our children. And I know if that happens, everything's going to be all right.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:12 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Tom and Lynn Meredith; former Lt. Gov. Ben F. Barnes of Texas and his wife, Melanie; Roy M. Spence, Jr., founder and president, GSD&M ad agency, and his wife, Mary; Mayor Kirk P. Watson of Austin; former Gov. Ann Richards of Texas; former Texas Land Commissioner Garry Mauro; author Liz Carpenter, co-founder, National Women's Political Caucus; Bernard (B.) Rapoport, chairman emeritus and founder, American Income Life Insurance Co., and his wife, Audrey; former Texas State Attorney General Dan Morales; former State Comptroller John Sharp; Luci Baines Johnson, daughter of President Lyndon B. Johnson; musician Lyle Lovett; and Charlton Heston, president, and Wayne LaPierre, executive vice president, National Rifle Association.

Memorandum on United States-Israel Cooperation on Affordable Housing and Community Development

June 19, 2000

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

Subject: U.S.-Israel Cooperation on Affordable Housing and Community Development

In order to enlarge the framework for policy research studies on affordable housing and related community development, one of our most pressing domestic problems, and

to strengthen relations with the State of Israel for the mutual benefit of the citizens of both countries, I hereby direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to begin discussions with the Government of Israel on issues pertaining to affordable housing and community development, with the aim of establishing a binational commission to structure a cooperative exchange program in this field. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall convene and chair the American side of this binational commission, and the membership should be composed of experts active in housing policy, mortgage markets, residential construction technology, economic development, neighborhood revitalization, and related fields of research and practice vital to the health and well-being of towns and cities. All activity undertaken pursuant to this memorandum shall be coordinated with the Department of State.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 20. An original was not available for verification of the content of this memorandum.

Remarks at a Welcoming Ceremony for King Mohamed VI of Morocco

June 20, 2000

Your Majesty, members of the Moroccan delegation, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the United States, I am delighted to welcome the King of Morocco to America.

Your Majesty, as we were just discussing, it was 22 years ago when the people of the United States first welcomed you to this House, when you came as Crown Prince with your father, His Majesty King Hassan II. Today we welcome you back in the same spirit of friendship that has joined our two nations since the beginning of the American republic.

Your Majesty, America will never forget that in 1777, the first nation in the world to recognize the United States was the Kingdom of Morocco. Ten years later, our two countries approved a treaty of peace and friendship, which today remains the longest

unbroken treaty of its kind in all history. In the days since, we have stood together to live up to that treaty's ideals and to secure its blessings for others.

During the Second World War, more than 300,000 Moroccans fought alongside the Allies against Nazi tyranny. Today, Moroccan soldiers stand shoulder to shoulder with Americans as we keep the peace in both Bosnia and Kosovo. Morocco's location has made it a bridge between east and west. Morocco's leadership has made it a bridge between peoples.

During the Second World War, King Mohamed V resisted efforts to target and capture Moroccan Jews. In our time, King Hassan worked hard to bring people together to secure a comprehensive peace for the people of the Middle East. He reminded us of the ancient wisdom of the Koran that if two groups of believers fight each other, we should endeavor to reconcile them. He helped bring us closer than we have ever been to a real and lasting peace.

Your Majesty, I was proud to walk with the people of Morocco on that sad day last July, when we crossed the city of Rabat to lay your father to rest. Providence called upon you to be one of the voices of a new generation of Arab leaders, and you have responded with courage and conviction, healing old wounds, promoting democracy, lifting those left behind, touching the hearts of your people. Morocco is a sterling example of Islamic tolerance, a force for peace, rooted in the common values of humanity.

In the 20th century, Morocco helped to make the world safe for democracy. In the 21st century, let us, together, make it also safe for diversity.

On the day that he died, His Majesty King Hassan, had a letter sitting on his desk ready to be signed, a letter he had asked to be drafted, that reaffirmed what he called, "our shared principles of freedom and solidarity, and our unshakable belief in the values of democracy, peace, prosperity, and progress." That letter was written on the very same kind of parchment as the letter passed between Sultan Mohammed III and President George Washington, more than two centuries ago. Your Majesty, in the days ahead, may we affirm that letter and our old, old friendship

with deeds, as well as words. May the partnership between our nations continue to show the way for the rest of the world.

Your Majesty, we are honored that you are here. We are honored by the way you represent your nation and the potential we have to build on our rich, long partnership. Welcome to the White House. Welcome to America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:24 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, where King Mohamed VI was accorded a formal welcome with full military honors. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of King Mohamed VI.

Remarks on the District of Columbia College Access Act

June 20, 2000

Thank you very much. Well, this is a very happy day. Welcome. I'd like to thank Representatives Eleanor Holmes Norton, Tom Davis, and Jim Moran for their role in this day; and Secretary Riley; OMB Director Lew, especially for his role as the Chair of the Federal DC Interagency Task Force. And I'd like to thank Grant Stockdale, who first proposed this idea several years ago.

I am sorry that Mayor Williams couldn't be with us today, but the city is very well represented. And I want to welcome the university presidents from George Mason, Trinity, Bowie State, and Delaware State who are here today, as well as students they'll be welcoming because of the DC College Access Act. We also have some of the educators and parents who helped get these children to college, and the leaders of the DC College Access program who are raising private funds to help local students meet all the costs of a university education.

Medicare Prescription Drug Coverage

I want to talk in a moment about all that you have done together, but because this is my only opportunity to be with the press today, I want to say just a few words about another issue where your example of bipartisanship could stand us in good stead, and that is our stewardship of the Medicare program.

This week the House is preparing to vote on a proposal for a prescription drug benefit for older Americans and people with disabilities. Unfortunately, in my opinion at least, the private insurance drug plan does not achieve that objective, of giving affordable, dependable coverage to every senior who needs it. At the same time, we have to face the challenge of making sure we pay the Medicare providers enough so they can give our seniors the high quality care they deserve.

Payments are too low in important areas, and Medicare patients are at risk. Some think we have to choose between the prescription drug benefit and adequate quality care. But because of our remarkable prosperity, I believe we can do both, especially given the present strength of the Medicare Trust Fund. And I think we should do it right.

Today I am proposing to dedicate \$40 billion over the next 10 years to ensure that our providers can continue to provide quality care. I think all of us recognize, and I do think this is a bipartisan recognition, that when we passed the Balanced Budget Act of '97, we did not provide adequate funding for the medical providers of the country, and this will help, by increasing Medicare payments to hospitals, teaching facilities, nursing homes, and the home health care programs, so that Medicare patients can get what they need.

My proposal also endorses Vice President Gore's initiatives to say for the very first time, the Medicare surplus will be off-budget, like the Social Security surplus, and therefore, can no longer be diverted for other purposes. Under the Vice President's plan, Medicare must be saved for paying down the debt in order to strengthen the life of the Medicare program.

Today the House is voting on a proposal that embraces this concept and takes an important step toward achieving the goal. And I'm very pleased, and again, I think it will have strong bipartisan support. I hope it will be strengthened in the Senate, so there will be absolutely no question that any loophole can allow the money to be spent in other ways.

District of Columbia College Assess Act

Now, just as we bear a heavy responsibility to our seniors, we also have perhaps an even heavier one to our young people, to do all we can to prepare them for the future. More and more, that requires that we offer every student the chance to go to college. In the coming years, the number of new jobs requiring a bachelor's degree will actually grow twice as fast as the jobs that require only a high school diploma. Over the course of a career, someone with a college degree today will earn, on average, \$600,000 more than someone with a high school diploma.

I have often said that I was the first person to go to college in my family, and I couldn't have done it without not only help from my family but without loans, scholarships, and jobs. Those things enabled me to have opportunities my parents' generation did not have, and without them, clearly, I wouldn't be standing here today making these remarks. So I think, like everyone in Congress who's been through the same experience, we want to make sure that the next generation has the same opportunity.

For years, too many of this city—our Capital City's young people have been left behind, not because they didn't have the ability but because they didn't have the resources to go on to college. This fall things will be different. Thanks to a remarkable coalition of business leaders, city and Federal officials, Republicans and Democrats, working together, many of them here today, the children of Washington will have the chance to go to public colleges around the country at in-State rates or get some help to go to a private school close to home.

The District of Columbia College Access Act makes the playing field a little more level for the children of Washington, DC. More students and parents will know that if they study hard and believe in themselves, the doors of college and the opportunity college brings will be open to them. And more middle income families will find that our great Nation's Capital is also a great place to live and raise their own children.

This fall more than a thousand young people, many of whom might never have had the chance, will get the help to go to college. We're paying the difference between in-State

and out-of-State tuition, sometimes as high as \$10,000 a year. And we're providing \$2,500 for young people who have chosen to attend local private colleges.

Washington businesses are helping many of these children pay for the costs of college—the other costs—and they've helped increase funding for the University of the District of Columbia, as well. This is a great example of what we can do if we put aside our differences to work toward a common goal. It is one of the best investments we could ever make.

One of the things that I am proudest of in my service as President is that we've had the opportunity to have the biggest expansion in college aid since the GI bill 50 years ago—expanded Pell grants, which many young Washingtonians use, education IRA's, the \$1,500 HOPE scholarship tax credit, and the lifetime learning tax credit for the third and fourth years of college and graduate school and adult education. And now I've asked Congress to pass a college opportunity tax cut that would allow every family to deduct up to \$10,000 of college tuition from their income tax every year.

We have the resources now. The question is whether we have the vision and will to give all our children a shot at living their dreams. This bill indicates that we do. And again, I want to thank these Representatives here, who played a leading role, and all of you who helped to pass this bill.

I'd like to now ask Dr. Alan Merten, the president of George Mason University; Zack Gamble; Secretary Riley; and Representatives Norton, Davis, Moran; and Jack Lew to come forward. I want to tell you that Zack Gamble is a young man who did well in college and was acceptable—accepted—acceptable and accepted—[laughter]—into several colleges. The DC College Access Act is making it possible for him to go to George Mason this fall to study computer science. We're going to present his tuition check now. It is just the first of many.

Zack, congratulations. And to all the other young people here, congratulations to you. Good luck to you. God bless you. And now, in the immortal words of that great movie, we're going to show you the money. [Laughter]

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:23 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Anthony A. Williams of the District of Columbia; Evan S. Dohelle, president, Trinity College; Calvin W. Lowe, president, Bowie State University; and William B. DeLauder, president, Delaware State University.

Radio Remarks on Signing the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000

June 20, 2000

Today I'm signing into law the Agriculture Risk Protection Act, which makes the Federal crop insurance system more inclusive and affordable. The bill also includes \$7.2 billion in emergency farm assistance to help farmers suffering from plummeting crop prices.

While this bill is important, it still fails to fix what is plainly an unsuccessful farm policy. We should be targeting assistance where it's truly needed instead of making payments to farmers who haven't planted a crop and don't need our help. That's why we need to revise, revamp, and improve the 1996 freedom to farm bill—to build a safety net that adequately protects our Nation's farmers.

NOTE: The President's remarks were recorded at approximately 11:30 a.m. on June 19 in Room 200 at the Joseph C. Lanzetta School (Public School 96) in New York City for later broadcast. The transcript was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 20. These remarks were also made available on the White House Press Office Actuality Line. H.R. 2559, approved June 20, was assigned Public Law No. 106–224.

Statement on Signing the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000

June 20, 2000

Today I have signed into law H.R. 2559, the "Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000," which authorizes permanent reforms to the crop insurance program, provides temporary farm income assistance in FY 2000, and provides funding and authorities for other agricultural and nutrition programs for FY 2001.

I support the reform of the crop insurance program that is included in this bill, because it is generally consistent with principles my Administration has advocated over the last 2 years. I have heard many farmers say that the crop insurance program was simply not a good value for them, providing too little coverage for too much money. My FY 2001 budget proposal and this bill directly address that problem by making higher insurance coverage more affordable, which should also mitigate the need for ad hoc crop loss disaster assistance such as we have seen for the last 3 years. The reforms in this bill will put risk management where it belongs: in the hands of producers. The bill will also expand coverage to more crops and provide incentives for new insurance product development, which will extend risk management to more producers and foster innovation in the risk management marketplace.

The bill includes a number of other provisions that I also support. The bill expands research authorities and funding for biomass and bioproducts, including next-generation ethanol, which will benefit producers by increasing the demand for agricultural products, and will diversify rural economies while cleaning our air and fighting global warming. The bill also provides income assistance to producers of a number of different crops, such as fruit and vegetable growers, and producers whose crop and pasture land has been flooded. In addition, the bill includes important reforms I requested to the Child and Adult Care Food Program and allows the use of school lunch application data to identify more children eligible for Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

However, I am signing H.R. 2559 with reservations because its income assistance component is not targeted, is counter-cyclical, and does not require recipients to enroll in crop insurance. If there was any doubt that the 1996 Farm Bill failed to provide an adequate farm safety net, it should be dispelled by this bill that provides significant supplemental farm income assistance for the third year in a row.

As I said when I signed the 1996 bill, the fixed Agricultural Marketing Transition Act (AMTA) payments simply do not adjust to changes in crop prices or revenues, and the

prolonged financial stress in the farm sector has required the Congress to repeatedly step in on an ad hoc basis to supplement farm bill assistance. To respond to the needs of producers suffering from continuing low crop prices and inadequate farm bill assistance, and to provide a sensible approach for the reauthorization of the farm bill in 2002, I proposed counter-cyclical farm income assistance in my FY 2001 Budget, which would provide higher payments on those crops with the most depressed prices and revenues. I am disappointed that the Congress did not adopt this proposal, and instead chose again simply to double the AMTA payments without regard to the hardships facing individual producers this year. Payments in this bill will be based on what producers grew prior to 1996, not what they are growing now, and some payment recipients may not even be growing covered crops anymore, having switched to other commodities or livestock production. We need to move beyond this kind of untargeted, patchwork fix to secure a stronger, more reliable farm safety net that provides dependable assistance to family farmers based on their current farm income.

Another crucial component of my farm safety net proposal is to significantly increase funds for conservation programs, such as the Conservation and Wetlands Reserve Programs, and a new Conservation Security Program. These programs can boost farm income to a wide range of producers, while providing environmental benefits for all Americans. I am disappointed that virtually no funds were included for these programs, and I will continue to seek substantially increased funding for them this year. Additionally, we want to work with the Congress to prevent an unintended sequester.

This bill's farm income assistance will help many producers get through what is shaping up to be another tough year, and the crop insurance reforms should enhance producers' ability to survive natural disasters for years to come. But I would hope that the experience of the last 3 years has taught those who shape farm policy on Capitol Hill—as farm families across the country have learned first-hand the hard way—that we need to build a stronger, better farm safety net on

which American producers, their families, and communities can depend.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 20, 2000.

NOTE: H.R. 2559, approved June 20, was assigned Public Law No. 106-224.

Statement on European Security and Defense Policy

June 20, 2000

I welcome the progress the European Union made at the Feira Summit to develop a common European security and defense policy. It will strengthen Europe's ability—and responsibility—to act in times of crisis. It will improve cooperation between the European Union and NATO. It will advance European unity while maintaining the vitality of the transatlantic alliance. I look forward to early implementation of the agreed steps, including the establishment of NATO-EU working groups and regular meetings with non-EU allies.

I also welcome the EU's commitment to create a standing roster of police officers who can be deployed to support peacekeeping missions. As we have seen in Bosnia and Kosovo, there is a critical need for international civilian police who can fill the gap between local police and military peacekeepers in countries emerging from conflict. We will continue to work with Europe to ensure such forces can deploy rapidly when they are needed.

Statement on Senate Action on Hate Crimes Legislation

June 20, 2000

Today the Senate held a historic and long-overdue vote on hate crimes legislation. I applaud the Senate for passing this crucial measure, and recognize the efforts of Senator Kennedy on this important issue. This amendment recognizes that hate crimes are different from other crimes. When Americans are targeted just because of who they

are—whether because of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, or disability—they hurt more. These crimes affect entire communities and strike at the heart of our American system of values. This important legislation sends a message that everyone is protected under the law.

This legislation also recognizes that State and local law enforcement still have primary responsibility for investigating and prosecuting hate crimes. It provides much needed assistance for State and local law enforcement agencies. It provides financial assistance through grants and help with investigations and prosecutions so that Federal, State, and local law enforcement can work together to ensure that perpetrators of hate crimes are brought to justice. In addition, the legislation ensures that Federal law enforcement officers confer with State and local law enforcement before bringing a case in Federal court.

Today a majority of the Senate has spoken. We must all work together to ensure that this amendment is not removed during conference. I urge all Members of Congress to send me this legislation to sign into law.

Statement on the Death of Former Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita of Japan

June 20, 2000

I was saddened to learn of the death of former Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita and wish to extend my condolences to his wife, Naoko, his daughters, and the Japanese people. Mr. Takeshita was a strong supporter of close U.S.-Japan relations and a good friend of the United States.

Statement on House of Representatives Action on Tobacco Legislation

June 20, 2000

I am very pleased that the House of Representatives reversed its position in favor of tobacco companies and today passed an amendment to advance public health by siding with American veterans and taxpayers.

The House decision today to reconsider its support of tobacco companies clears the path for the Veterans Administration to help support tobacco litigation, which could mean billions of dollars to improve veterans medical care. I applaud the perseverance of a bipartisan group, led by Representative Henry Waxman, Representative Lane Evans, Representative Jim Hansen, Representative Martin Meehan, Representative Debbie Stabenow, Representative David Obey, and Representative Lloyd Doggett, whose efforts in past days have resulted in this significant victory.

In the coming days and weeks, there will be other attempts by Congress to block the Federal Government's tobacco litigation with riders supported by tobacco companies. This bipartisan victory should be a model for Congress. The legal responsibility of the tobacco companies should be decided in the courts by the judicial process. I call upon Congress to reject the interests of big tobacco and permit justice to run its course.

Remarks at a State Dinner Honoring King Mohamed VI of Morocco

June 20, 2000

Ladies and gentlemen, Your Majesty, members of the Moroccan delegation, welcome all of you to the White House this evening. No foreign guest is more deserving of a warm welcome here than King Mohamed.

Your Majesty, as I said this morning, it is well known that when the 13 separate States of America declared themselves the United States, your ancestor, Sultan Sidi Mohamed, was the very first sovereign to recognize our new Nation.

The greatest heroes of our early history were the strongest proponents of friendship with Morocco. The treaty of friendship between our Nations was urged on Congress by Benjamin Franklin, drafted by Thomas Jefferson, signed by John Adams, and affirmed by George Washington in a letter to the Sultan. Our treaty of friendship is the oldest American treaty of its kind still enforced today.

In the two centuries since it was first signed, we have seen much to admire and be grateful for in our friendship. As the Arab nation which lies closest to the West, you have been a bridge across cultures. You have a proud tradition of independence, known the world over for your generosity and hospitality. The oldest property owned by America on foreign soil is one of the most beautiful buildings in Tangier, a gift to our country from yours.

Your Majesty, Hillary and Chelsea have visited your country three times now. They have been charmed again and again by the special character of Morocco, the warmth and hospitality of your people, the beauty of the mountains and the Madinahs, and especially, your generosity of spirit.

For centuries, your land has been a model of religious tolerance. When she was there, Hillary asked people throughout your country, "Where did you learn this tolerance?" And over and over again they said, "We learned it from our parents." In Morocco, Your Majesty, that appears to be especially true of kings.

During World War II, your wise and courageous grandfather blocked efforts of the Vichy government to identify and label Moroccan Jews. Decades later, your father bravely opened a dialog with Israel, paved the way for the Camp David accords, and proved it is possible to be commander of the faithful and a bridge between faiths.

I was honored and humbled to represent the United States in Rabat last year to show our respect and affection for your father. I will never forget setting forth on foot from the Royal Palace to the mausoleum and seeing hundreds of thousands, indeed, millions, of mourners on rooftops and treetops and along the side streets, surging toward the cortege, expressing their deep devotion to him.

I am pleased to tell you tonight that we are establishing, in honor of your father, the King Hassan II Memorial Scholarship Program to enable students from Morocco to study here in America, and to study subjects close to the King's heart: international affairs and conflict resolution.

The people of Morocco also have immense devotion to you, Your Majesty. You have emphasized the need to improve schools for

children and create jobs for their parents. You have moved to heal old wounds, promote political freedoms, protect human rights, and reach out to your people.

You have shown the courage and vision to elevate Morocco as a model of openness, prosperity, and inclusion. This is vital, not only for Morocco but also for people far beyond your borders. Friends of peace and tolerance are needed now, perhaps more than ever, as we approach the moment of truth in the Middle East peace process.

Your Majesty, America is eager to continue and to deepen our two-century-old friendship. We are eager to work with you toward a world of greater hope and understanding across cultures and continents. In that spirit, we welcome you again to the land shown such favor by your forefathers.

Welcome to America. Thank you for your friendship, and may it last forever.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:24 p.m. in a pavilion on the South Lawn at the White House. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of King Mohamed VI.

Remarks on Presenting the Congressional Medal of Honor to Asian-American Heroes of World War II

June 21, 2000

Chaplain Hicks; distinguished Members of the Senate and the House who are here in large numbers; Secretary and Mrs. Cohen; Secretary and Mrs. West; Secretary Shalala; other members of the administration who are here, I thank all of you for being here on this profoundly important day.

In early 1945 a young Japanese-American of the 442d Regimental Combat Team lay dead on a hill in southern France—the casualty of fierce fighting with the Germans. A chaplain went up to pray over him, to bless him, to bring him back down. As the chaplain later said, "I found a letter in his pocket. The soldier had just learned that some vandals in California had burned down his father's home and barn in the name of patriotism. And yet, this young man had volunteered for every patrol he could go on."

In a few moments I will ask the military aides to read individual citations, detailing the extraordinary bravery of 22 Asian-American soldiers—some still with us, some to be represented by family members. We recognize them today with our Nation's highest military honor, the Medal of Honor. They risked their lives, above and beyond the call of duty. And in so doing, they did more than defend America; in the face of painful prejudice, they helped to define America at its best.

We have many distinguished Americans here today—Members of the Senate and House, including at least one Medal of Honor winner, Senator Kerrey. We have former Senators and House Members here. But there is one person I would like to introduce and ask to stand because, in a profound and fundamental way, he stands on the shoulders of these whom we honor today, and all those who have worked for 50 years to set the record straight. Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to recognize the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, General Eric Shinseki.

Immediately following Pearl Harbor, Japanese-Americans in the United States military were forced to surrender their weapons. National Guardsmen were dismissed; volunteers were rejected; draft-age youth were classified as, quote, "enemy aliens." Executive Order 9066 authorized military commanders to force more than 100,000 Japanese-Americans from their homes and farms and businesses onto trains and buses and into camps, where they were placed behind barbed wire in tar-paper barracks, in places like Manzanar, Heart Mountain, Topaz. I am sad to say that one of the most compelling marks of my youth is that one of those was in my home State.

One resident of the camps remembers his 85-year-old grandmother standing in line for food with her tin cup and plate. Another remembers only watchtowers, guards, guilt, and fear. Another has spent years telling her children, "No, grandfather was not a spy."

The astonishing fact is that young men of Japanese descent, both in Hawaii and on the mainland, were still willing, even eager, to take up arms to defend America.

In 1942 a committee of the Army recommended against forming a combat unit of Japanese-Americans, citing, and I quote, "the universal distrust in which they are held." Yet, Americans of Japanese ancestry, joined by others of good faith, pressed the issue, and a few months later President Roosevelt authorized a combat team of Japanese-American volunteers.

In approving the unit, FDR said, "Americanism is a matter of the mind and heart. Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry." That statement from President Roosevelt, so different from the Executive order of just a year before, showed a nation pulled between its highest ideals and its darkest fears. We were not only fighting for freedom and equality abroad, we were also in a struggle here at home over whether America would be defined narrowly, on the basis of race, or broadly, on the basis of shared values and ideals.

When young Japanese-American men volunteered enthusiastically, some Americans were puzzled. But those who volunteered knew why. Their own country had dared to question their patriotism, and they would not rest until they had proved their loyalty.

As sons set off to war, so many mothers and fathers told them, "Live if you can; die if you must; but fight always with honor, and never, ever bring shame on your family or your country."

Rarely has a nation been so well served by a people it had so ill-treated. For their numbers and length of service, the Japanese-Americans of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, including the 100th Infantry Battalion, became the most decorated unit in American military history. By the end of the war, America's military leaders in Europe all wanted these men under their command. Their motto was "Go for Broke." They risked it all to win it all.

They created a custom of reverse AWOL—wounded soldiers left their hospital beds against doctors' order to return to battle. They were veterans of seven brutal campaigns. They fought in Italy to overwhelm entrenched German positions that blocked the path north. They fought in France and liberated towns that still remember them with memorials. They took 800 casualties in

just 5 days of continuous combat in southern France, to rescue the lost battalion of Texas which had been surrounded by German troops.

As their heroic efforts forced back the Nazis in Europe, news of their patriotism began to beat back prejudice in America. But prejudice is a stubborn foe. Captain Daniel Inouye, back from the war, in full uniform, decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross, the Bronze Star, Purple Heart with Cluster, and 12 other medals and citations, tried to get a haircut and was told, "We don't cut Jap hair." As Captain Inouye said later, "I was tempted to break up the place," but he had already done all the fighting he needed to do.

People across the country had learned of his heroism and that of his colleagues, and loyal Americans were eager to teach others the difference between patriotism and prejudice. A group of Army veterans who knew firsthand the heroism of Japanese-American soldiers, attacked prejudice in a letter to the Des Moines Register. It said, "When you have seen these boys blown to bits, going through shellfire that others refused to go through, that is the time to voice your opinion, not before."

In Los Angeles, a Japanese-American soldier boarded a bus in full uniform, as a passenger hurled a racial slur. The driver heard the remark, stopped the bus, and said, "Lady, apologize to this American soldier or get off my bus." This defense of our ideals here at home was inspired by the courage of Japanese-Americans in battle.

Senator Inouye, you wrote that your father told you as you left at age 18 to join the Army and fight a war that the Inouyes owe an unrepayable debt to America. If I may say so, sir, more than half a century later, America owes an unrepayable debt to you and your colleagues.

Fifty-four summers ago, just a few steps from this very spot, President Truman greeted the returning members of the 442d and told them, "You fought, not only the enemy but you fought prejudice, and you have won." Let us not also forget that Americans of Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Filipino descent, along with Alaskan natives, all faced the same blind prejudice.

That is why we are proud to honor here today the service of Second Lieutenant Rudolph B. Davila, an American of Filipino and Spanish descent, who risked his life to help break through the German lines near Anzio; and Captain Francis Wai, an American of Chinese descent, who gave his life securing an important beachhead in the Philippine Islands. Americans of Asian descent did much more than prove they were Americans; they made our Nation more American. They pushed us toward that more perfect Union of our Founders' dreams.

The report of the Presidential Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, some 20 years ago now, called internment an injustice, based on "race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership." It prescribed several steps for redress, including an apology from the Congress and the President.

Some years later, many leaders backed legislation sponsored by Senator Daniel Akaka, to review the combat records of Asian-Americans in World War II to determine if any deserving service members had been passed over for the Medal of Honor. The review found, indeed, that some extraordinarily brave soldiers never did receive the honors they clearly had earned.

So today America awards 22 of them the Medal of Honor. They risked their lives on their own initiative, sometimes even against orders, to take out machine guns, give aid to wounded soldiers, draw fire, pinpoint the enemy, protect their own. People who can agree on nothing else fall silent before that kind of courage.

But it is long past time to break the silence about their courage, to put faces and names with the courage, and to honor it by name: Davila, Hajiro, Hayashi, Inouye, Kobashigawa, Okutsu, Sakato, Hasemoto, Hayashi, Kuroda, Moto, Muranaga, Nakae, Nakamine, Nakamura, Nishimoto, Ohata, Okubo, Ono, Otani, Tanouye, Wai. These American soldiers, with names we at long last recognize as American names, made an impact that soars beyond the force of any battle. They left a lasting imprint on the meaning of America. They didn't give up on our country, even when too many of their countrymen

and women had given up on them. They deserve, at the least, the most we can give—the Medal of Honor.

I would like now to ask the military aides to read the citations.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:45 p.m. in a pavilion on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Brig. Gen. David H. Hicks, chaplain, USA, who gave the invocation; Secretary Cohen's wife, Janet Langhart Cohen; and Secretary West's wife, Gail.

Videotape Remarks to Participants of the Scripps Howard National Spelling Bee

June 21, 2000

I'm glad to have this opportunity to welcome all of you to Washington and to the 73d annual National Spelling Bee.

In 1961, when I was about your age, President Kennedy said we should think of education as a private hope and dream, which fulfilled can benefit everyone and strengthen our Nation. That's even more true today. Your long list of accomplishments, uncommon dedication, and commitment to learning will serve as a lifelong asset to you and to your communities.

Regardless of who wins today, you should all be proud of your achievements. You've come a long way. So I join your parents and your teachers in congratulating you. Your commitment to excellence spells success in the years ahead, not just for you but for all America.

Thank you, and good luck today.

NOTE: The address was videotaped at approximately 5:30 p.m. on May 11 in the Map Room for later broadcast. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Report

June 21, 2000

Today's report by the Treasury Department's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF) demonstrates that our administration is tough on gun traffickers who peddle guns to criminals and young people.

Between July 1996 and December 1998, ATF initiated more than 1,500 firearms trafficking investigations, resulting in Federal convictions of 812 criminals to a total of 7,420 years in prison—with an average sentence of 9 years.

Gun trafficking puts thousands of guns onto our Nation's streets and contributes significantly to our Nation's gun violence problem. The investigations documented in today's report involved the diversion of more than 84,000 firearms from the legal to illegal market. The report shows that loopholes in our laws help make gun shows and corrupt gun dealers major channels for gun trafficking. Many of the diverted weapons supplied by traffickers were later used to commit serious crimes, including homicides, robberies, and assaults. Each gun put into the hand of a criminal represents the possibility of one more life lost, one more family destroyed.

Through tough enforcement and smart prevention, we have reduced gun crime by 35 percent and increased Federal gun prosecutions 16 percent since 1992. There is more we can do to keep guns out of the wrong hands. I will continue to press the Congress to fully fund my \$280 million gun enforcement initiative, to add more ATF agents and inspectors to crack down on gun traffickers, corrupt gun dealers, and armed gun criminals, as well as hire more Federal, State, and local gun prosecutors to put more gun criminals behind bars. But Congress must also close the deadly loopholes in our laws that make guns accessible to criminals and children in the first place. Congress should move forward to close the deadly gun show loophole once and for all and pass other stalled commonsense gun measures without further delay.

Remarks at an Irish-American Democrats Dinner Honoring Terence McAuliffe

June 21, 2000

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. First of all, let me say, I had to rush over here from another event, and I didn't

have time to go change my tie. *[Laughter]* I thank you for letting me come anyway.

Thank you, Stella, for everything you said and for everything you've done these last 4 years. Thank you, Chris Dodd, for being willing to take the chairmanship of the Democratic Party when they said our party and its President were dead as a doornail, and we proved that we had a little Irish left. *[Laughter]* And you've been great, and I'll never be able to thank you enough.

We have some other people here I want to acknowledge: the best Secretary of Education in the history of this country, Dick Riley is here; Congressman Joe Crowley from Queens. Congressman Jim Maloney from Connecticut is here, I think. Where are you, Jim? *[Applause]* Lieutenant Governor Kathleen Kennedy Townsend from Maryland.

Let me say—I'm going to do a little pander here—I'll be bad fooled if someday we're not out here campaigning for her on the national ticket.

And now we come to the would-be, want-to-be Irish—*[laughter]*—and some very good friends of Ireland, Senator Chuck Robb of Virginia. I've said this every place I could, but one of the things the Irish admire are people of conscience who do what they think is right against all the odds. I could make you a very compelling case that based on his constituency and the people arrayed against him, that Chuck Robb is the bravest person in the United States Senate. He needs your help to be reelected, and I want you to help him.

Congressman Donald Payne from New Jersey, a true friend of ours, thank you. And Representative Sheila Jackson Lee from Houston is here. Our present Democratic chair and the former mayor of Philadelphia, Ed Rendell. The first time he ran for mayor he spent half his advertising money trying to convince people he was Irish. *[Laughter]*

Then we have, I see John Raffaelli back there, the Italian-Irish—*[laughter]*—Tim Chorba over there; Rashid Chaudary the Pakistani-Irish—*[laughter]*. I'm saying this for a point. I'm getting to McAuliffe here in a minute. *[Laughter]* I want to say three things very briefly.

First of all, I want to thank you. Thank you for giving me the chance to serve as President. Thank you for supporting me. Thank you for helping us to make America's role in the Irish peace process a constructive one and to do the things that have been done here in the United States. It's been an unbelievable experience. We've still got a lot to do, and it's also been a lot of fun. And it wouldn't have been any of that if I hadn't had the support of the American Irish, and we hadn't been involved, as we've had the chance to be, in the Irish peace process. It's been a wonderful experience, and I'm very grateful to you.

The second thing I want to say to you is that the President may get all the blame when things go wrong, but he also gets the credit when things go right. And very often a lot of other people are involved, without whom none of that would have happened. And I want to mention two people in particular because they both need your help.

One is, when I took all that flack for getting involved in the Irish peace process, and I was being ridiculed by the members of the other party—Secretary Baker, a man I actually like quite a lot, did call it "Gullible's Travel." None of the elitists really thought I ought to do it. But all us blue-collar red-necks thought it was a pretty good idea.

But I want you to know that it was tough. And there was a huge part of the permanent Government that thought I had taken leave of my senses. And I want you to know that Al Gore stood with me in that. And you need to know that.

The second thing I want to say is that I'm especially proud of the work that my wife did in Northern Ireland with the Vital Voices, the women, the Protestant and Catholic women. And they need your help, and they deserve it.

And I want to say one other thing about the peace process. One of the reasons that I wanted to do this, quite apart from my Irish roots where the Cassidy family goes back to Fermanagh—*[inaudible]*—and they've given me a little water color of the 18th century farmhouse. It's the oldest house we can find that has any ties to anybody that's kin to me that at least will admit it. *[Laughter]* When

I got elected President, I had all these relatives turn up, you know. [Laughter] It was kind of weird.

I did get a letter, you should know, though, from an 88-year-old woman in northern Louisiana who explained to me—and she sent an identical letter to the other person—how I was the 12th cousin of the great mystery writer from Mississippi, John Grisham. And my mother's parents were Cassidy and Grisham. And of all the people—and I wrote John a letter, and he's a wonderful guy, used to be a Democratic legislator in Mississippi, which was almost an oxymoron for a while, but we're coming back. [Laughter] And I told him that I was delighted, not only because I liked his books but because of all the relatives that had turned up, he was the only one who had any money. [Laughter] So I liked that.

But I felt, in addition to wanting to do this, that if we could make it work, this old, old conflict, with its legendary, sometimes romantic, often horrible ramifications, that the United States could then go to other places in the world and make the same argument—that if the Irish could do it, you could do it.

You might be interested to know, you might remember that not very long ago, around last Christmas, I went to Kosovo, after the war was over. And we're still having a lot of trouble there, but the wounds are fresher there. And I got everybody in the room, the leaders of all the various sects—the various Kosovar Albanian groups and the Serbian groups and the minority groups there—there are several other ethnic minorities there—and we're sitting around a little table and metal chairs in this little airport room. And I said, "Look, let me tell you something. I've been working for all these years on the Irish peace process." And I said, "Here's the deal they've agreed to: the principle of consent, majority rule, minority rights, shared decisionmaking, shared benefits, and ties to their neighbors that they have ethnic and religious ties to."

I said, "Now, you can have that deal today, or you can air all your grievances and whine and beat the table and walk away and refuse to talk to each other and keep letting people die around the edges. And 20 years from now

somebody else will be sitting in metal chairs like this, making the deal. And the deal will be majority rule, minority rights, shared decisionmaking, shared benefits, and ties with your neighbors. You can do it now, or you can do it later. But you look at what the Irish did—that's what you're going to have to do. You can do it now, or later. I'd advise you to do it now, while the rest of the world still cares a whole lot about you."

If this hadn't happened in Ireland, I could not have made that speech. And you need to know that.

Now, the next thing I want to tell you is, I realize I'm preaching to the saved here, and I don't need to give you a campaign speech for Al Gore or for our candidates for the Senate or the House. But I want to tell you, I worked as hard as I could to deal with the big problems of this country, to turn the country around, to get it going in the right direction. Nothing lasts forever. If you've ever been through bad times, you thank God for that. But when you have good times, you really have to cherish them and make the most of them.

This country has the chance of a lifetime now to build the future of our dreams for these children. People ask me all the time, who do you think is going to win the election? And my answer is, it depends on what the people think the election is about. Often, the answer depends upon the question you ask. And what this election ought to be about is how are we going to make the most of this moment of promise for all the people of this country? How are we going to fulfill our responsibilities to people around the world, to build the kind of world we want our children to live in? How are we going to deal with these big things?

So, I'm for Al Gore because he's by far the most effective Vice President in the history of the country. He's done more good and had more impact in that job by far than anybody who ever had it. Because he will keep the prosperity going, because he wants to spread it to people who haven't been part of it, and because he understands the future and knows how to get us there—so I'm for him.

But the things I want you to remember about this election are these: It's real important. There are profound differences between our candidates. And number three, only the Democrats want you to know what those differences are.

You watch these guys campaigning; you'd think they'd never even had a primary and made those commitments. Like all of this just sprung—and it's flattering, and I suppose we should be happy about it, but you need to go out there and tell people about that. We're for a Patients' Bill of Rights, and they're not. We believe that everybody on Medicare ought to have access to prescription drugs they can afford, and they don't. We're for an increase in the minimum wage, and they aren't. And I could go on and on.

But this is very important. Look, we don't have to run these elections the way some of these sort of tormented elections have been run in the last 20 years, where each candidate was trying to convince the people that their opponent was just one notch above a car thief. I mean, this doesn't have to be a negative campaign. Nobody has to be smeared. You can say, "Look, we've got honorable people from the top to the bottom on both sides. All we have to do is assume they mean what they say, see what they've said, see what they've done, compare where they are and where they want to go. Let the American people make up their mind." It ought to be a serious election, but a decent one. But don't pretend there are no differences, and don't let anybody tell you when you point out the difference that that's a negative campaign.

Because there are people here who want the voters to believe there are no real consequences to which way they vote. And that is not true. I've done everything I could do to turn this country around, to keep it going. I'm going to do everything I can in the next 7 months I have. But you've got to do your job and give the election back to the people, but tell them there are real consequences and real differences, and they need to face up to what they are and vote—[inaudible].

Now, what's all this got to do with Terry? A lot. [Laughter] A lot. I told somebody the other day, I think there's a real difference in whether somebody who's done well in this

country and made some money, got a world of friends and contacts, is out there raising money to get himself another tax cut, or to try to get the people who work in this hotel an increase in their wages, or give them a tax break so their kids can go to college, or trying to make sure all working people can afford to give their children health insurance.

And in the system we have, I wouldn't still be here doing what I'm doing if he didn't do what he's done. You'd be amazed how many conversations we have where we're just talking about the issues. Well, how are you doing with the Middle East peace process? Are you going to get that Patients' Bill of Rights or not? So the first thing I want you to know is this guy believes in what we're doing. If he didn't, he could be over there in the other party and he'd be making more money, out of raising all this money, than he's going to do because of me and what he's doing for the Vice President.

The second thing I want you to know is that he and I have one thing in common that maybe shows that we both need help. [Laughter] But we're crazy enough to think that this is fun and that we're lucky to be doing this. I can just tell you from my point of view, one or two little other breaks in life and I'd still be home doing deeds and real estate transfers, you know. [Laughter] People say, "Oh, hasn't it been horrible?" I say, "Are you kidding? I could be home writing deeds." [Laughter]

You need to know—McAuliffe goes out to L.A., and they say we're having trouble financing the convention. He's there 3 hours and total strangers are walking up to him on the street throwing money at him. I mean, it's unbelievable. [Laughter] Why? Because he's having a good time, obviously doing what he believes.

It is a great gift to be able to make people believe that they can do something important and enjoy it at the same time. It is a great gift to make people believe that they have something unique that they can contribute. It is the true mark of leadership, since none of us is indispensable—me included—none of us have the whole truth, and all of us have something to give. He is better at making people understand that than any human being I have ever known.

And Stella was up here bragging about how he had intelligence and energy and charm. And I thought, where's the blarney part? [Laughter] But I'm telling you, I know this guy. I know him well. And he's kind of hot right now because he's raising all this money and having a good time doing it. But what you need to know is, he believes in what he raised it for. He believes in what we've done here these last 8 years. And he knows that we couldn't have done it if he hadn't done what he did.

And he's given in unique ways thousands of us a chance to be a part of changing America for the better. And I think that's something that his wife and his children and his family and his friends ought to be very, very proud of. Because this is a better country today because of Terry McAuliffe.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:15 p.m. in the Rooftop Ballroom at the Washington Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Stella O'Leary, president, Irish-American Democrats; John D. Raffaelli, partner, Washington Group; former U.S. Ambassador to Singapore Timothy A. Chorba; and Rashid Chaudary, president, Raani Corporation.

Remarks at a Hillary 2000 Dinner

June 21, 2000

That was one of my great jokes—[inaudible]—that I intended to be president again next year, president of the Senate spouses' club. [Laughter]

Let me say that I love coming to this magnificent home. I'm always so happy here. It's a happy place. I love being here. And now I'm here as surrogate-in-chief. Hillary is in New York tonight, and I was delighted to come by and have a chance to talk to you at the table.

I would like to just say a couple of things. First of all, thank you. I am very grateful that I've had a chance to serve as President. And I'm grateful that I had a chance to get elected in a moment where I felt that I had some ideas that would change the country for the better—and only after I've had years and years and years and years of working seriously on these ideas so I could test them,

and it turned out most of them worked out pretty well. And I feel good about it.

We've still got a lot of good things going, and I think a lot of good things are going to happen in the next 7 months. You may have seen yesterday the House—the Senate passed the hate crimes legislation I've been pushing for 2 years. A couple of days before that, the House reversed itself and decided to leave my process of creating national monuments to protect land for all time to come alone. We're moving on a lot of the fronts that I hope we'll have some progress on. I think we will.

The second point I'd like to make is that people come up to me all the time and say, "Well, who is going to win this election or that election or the other"—except I always say Hillary now, but apart from that—and I believe that very strongly. But I think my experience has been that the outcome of elections are largely determined by what the voters believe the elections are about.

That's what you were talking to me tonight on the New York City—what you think the election is about may determine more than anything else which candidate you vote for. And what I have been trying to hammer home all across the country, to all kinds of audiences—partisan audiences, nonpartisan audiences alike—is that this election must be about what we're going to do with our prosperity.

Eight years ago when we were in deep trouble—the economy was down; society was divided; we had all kinds of difficulties—everybody knew what we had to do. We had to roll up our sleeves and get out of the ditch. We had to turn things around. We had to put things moving in the right direction. Well, now things are moving in the right direction, and the real question is, what do we do with it, not just the budget surplus but the confidence, the capacity, to deal with the challenges facing the country, to deal with the big opportunities out there?

And if the American people think that is what we should do, then we're going to have a very good election. Because that means it's no longer necessary to have one of these sort of mudslinging campaigns where everybody tries to convince everybody else that their opponent is just one step above a car thief.

I mean, how many elections have we had like that? That's not necessary. You start with the two Presidential candidates, you go through these Senate races, these House races, you've got people that make a very presentable case for their point of view and that argue it out. And so we really can have an election about the future.

And I worked as hard as I could to turn this country around, get it going in the right direction, and that's really what I want to have. If you believe that, then there are three things I want you to know—and don't laugh. Number one, it's a really big election. How a country deals with its prosperity is as important a test of its character and judgment as how you deal with adversity.

There's not a person around this room tonight who cannot remember one instance in your life when you made a mistake, not because things were going so badly but because things were going so well, you thought there was no consequence to the failure to—[*inaudible*—if you live long enough. Everybody knows that. So this is a big election.

Point number two, there are real and honest differences between the candidates for President, for Senator, for the House, and people, historically, pretty well do what they say they're going to do when they get in office. Contrary to a popular expression that all politicians are a bunch of slugs and don't keep their word, by and large, they do. If you look at all the historical studies, they do pretty much what they said they were going to do.

One of the proudest days I've had as President was in '95, when things looked so bleak for us, a scholar of the Presidency and the media named Thomas Patterson published a report and said I kept a higher percentage of my promises to the American people than any of the last five Presidents by '95, even though I'd made more, which made me feel very good. But most people will do most of the things they say.

And usually when a President doesn't do it, you wind up being glad. For example, aren't you glad that Abraham Lincoln didn't keep his promise not to free the slaves? That was one of his 1860 campaign promises. Aren't you glad that Franklin Roosevelt didn't keep his promise to balance the budg-

et in 1932, when we had 25 percent of the people out of work in 1933? It would have been exactly the wrong thing to do for him, just like it was the right thing to do for me. So basically, you've got a big, important election; you've got real differences.

Now, here's the third thing, only the Democrats want you to know what the differences are. Really. The real differences. You see that in the way the Republicans are basically trying to make everybody forget they had a primary season in which they made a lot of very specific commitments, and they don't want to talk about them anymore.

But I think they're honorable. I think they'll keep the commitments they made in the primaries. And it makes it uncomfortable for them when, like Mr. LaPierre, the NRA guy, says, "Well, we'll have an office in the White House if Bush wins the election," because they want him to go away until after the election.

But there are real differences, and by and large, they relate to how we think we ought to manage this moment of prosperity.

And I'll just say a brief word about the Vice President. I do believe by now I know him as well as anybody besides his wife, maybe his children. He's been, by far—as a matter of historical fact, he's had by far a greater positive impact on the country in this job than anyone who has ever had this job.

Now, I have to make full disclosure. That's a very self-serving statement for me because the way the job works, you've got to know what the President asks the Vice President to do. But I've spent a lot of time studying the Presidency, and I never could figure out why you would want a Vice President who didn't go to work every day. I never could figure out why the Presidents felt threatened by their Vice President—I didn't get all that stuff.

I picked Al Gore because he basically was in tune with me, and we got along together. But he knew things I didn't know. He had experiences I didn't have, and he has made an absolutely incalculable contribution to whatever good we've accomplished in the White House. And I think he should be elected because I agree with his economic plan, as compared with the alternative, and we

need to keep the prosperity going; because I know he'll work harder to extend the benefits of our prosperity to other people, whether it's the differences they have over the minimum wage or the Patients' Bill of Rights or you name it. And because he understands the future. He understands issues like climate change and the other energy and environmental issues, or the Internet privacy issues, which I predict will be very big for all of you over the next 5 or 6 years. All of our medical records and all of our financial records and all of our other records, everything is on a computer somewhere. I think that's a big issue.

I'm very pro-high technology. I've tried to do everything I could to create as many jobs to support a competitive environment with the Telecommunications Act and all. But I think these privacy issues are going to be big.

So I think he's good because I like his economic plan. I think he'll do more to help everybody participate in our society, and I think he understands the future. And it's really important, because the next 8 years are going to be different from the last 8. The issue is not whether we're going to change; the issue is how are we going to change.

I wouldn't vote for anybody that said, "Hey, I'd like to be President because I'll do everything Bill Clinton did." I wouldn't support a candidate—that would be wrong. Things are changing too much. So that's my take on that.

Now, in Hillary's case, what I think will happen is she'll go through a period of time where—apparently, just looking, I saw Mr. Lazio had a film the other day that had me on it, saying something nice about him. Well, I'm not like them. If a Republican votes on something that I think's good, I'll brag on them. I'm not ashamed of it. I don't think you have to say, just because somebody is a member of the other party, that they're right over there with Attila the Hun.

But I kind of—it was a gas that he would try to give the people of New York the impression that I'd prefer him to my wife in the Senate. [*Laughter*] Because she would have voted for my economic plan, not against it, and she would have voted against the contract on America, not for it. She wouldn't vote to shut the Government down and get

rid of the Department of Education or get rid of the 100,000 police that lowered the crime rate in New York and other places. So, there, too, there are real differences.

I think the big issue here on the economic front for both of them—and it's one that all of you need to think about because you could actually be better off the day after it passed with the Republican plan, everybody here—the day after it passed. Because basically, what they want to do is spend the whole projected surplus on the tax cut, for Social Security transition costs and extra defense costs. And what we want to do—even though I'm not a candidate, I strongly support this—is to set aside at a minimum—at an absolute rock-bottom minimum—at least 20 percent of this projected surplus which comes then from your Medicare taxes, and put it in a Medicare Trust Fund, and get it away from any spending, and use it to continue to pay the debt down, and then we want to have a tax cut that's much smaller, probably about 40 percent the size of theirs—still substantial, but not as big as theirs—slightly less than half of it—and we want to invest more money in education and research and technology and health care and the environment.

Now, why is ours better? Because, number one, we may not have—just because some economist says we're going to have \$1.9 trillion over the next 10 years doesn't mean it's going to happen. And I'll bet you everybody in this room, in your heart of hearts, says, "Gee, I hope that will happen, but it might not." You know, we might not have 4 years like these last 7 years.

If I tell you—this gentleman was telling me about his business in Buffalo; if I said, "What's your projected revenue? Are you going to go out and not only spend it all, but borrow money on the basis of it, no matter what, with no safety net?" you probably wouldn't do that. And so I think if we—I believe if you have sort of a Bush-Lazio tax plan, and it passed, you'd all be better off the day after because all of you can afford to come here tonight. But you wouldn't be better off if it led to a 2-percent increase in interest rates. But in 2 years, the impact it would have on the markets, on the overall economy, on the unemployment rate, you'd be worse off. And the overall economy would

be worse off, and we wouldn't have any money to do these things.

And the way our crowd has it structured is, number one, they're going to save 20 percent of the money on the front end and put it into Medicare, as long as it materializes, which is good because when the baby boomers retire it's going to be hard to—[*inaudible*]*—and we're going to keep paying the debt down as fast as we can, which I believe is good. I think since there's so much private debt, we should pay the public debt down and keep interest rates as low as possible. That's what I believe.*

And most of the people I know that have done well in this economy, if they have to choose between low interest rates and a growing stock market and a tax cut, and if it's either/or, they would choose the former every single time. So this is a big issue, and I think it's important.

The second big cluster of issues, I'll say again: what do you believe our obligations are to those who haven't done as well in this whole thing as we have or those that have got the good jobs, but they have other problems.

The biggest challenge most working families, even upper class working families that work for salaries, face today is how to balance the burden of raising their children and succeeding at work. Because in the United States we have less support for that than our competing countries do. We don't do as much to help people pay for child care. We don't do as much to make sure they all have affordable health insurance. We don't do as much to make sure the kids are all in preschool or after-school programs. We don't do as much to guarantee that they have family leave options so that if the baby is sick or the parents are sick or there's a newborn baby, that everybody can get pretty much what they need.

Now, I think this whole cluster of family-related issues, I'll predict to you, will be very big over the next decade, because we're not all working just to have money to go spend it on things; that's not why people do it. They find reward from their work, and they try to run businesses that they're proud of, and they want to raise families they're proud of. And this all has to be done in the context

of a certain value structure. And if we've got a country where, in order to be a success, you have to just basically walk away from your responsibilities as parents, we're in deep trouble here. And this is a challenge for every business, for everybody, and we're going to have to work through a lot of these issues together.

But one of the reasons that I think Hillary ought to go to the Senate is that she spent 30 years working on this stuff. She knows more than anyone I personally know about adoption, about foster care, about the children's health care and emotional and nutritional and educational needs, about the relationship of early childhood brain development to whatever the Government policy is. She has lived with this stuff.

And I was just kind of surprised when all those New York House Members came to see her and asked her to run for the Senate. I was surprised she'd even think of it. I said, "Do you know how much this is going to cost you?" She said, "You're talking to me about money?" [*Laughter*] She laughed at me. She said, "You, who have never cared if we had a nickel in the bank"—[*inaudible*]*—and we laughed about it, you know, and we admitted that in the end we were kind of public service junkies. It's what we care about. [Laughter]*

And for 30 years she's worked for me and worked on the side. The whole time we were in Arkansas, she gave away lots of potential income every year just to do public service, because it's what she wanted to do. And I can just tell you that in a lot of ways she's better than I am on a lot of this stuff, and she knows things I don't know. And she will be absolutely unbelievable.

I know there are still some people in New York who say, "Well, why is she doing this, and why are they coming to New York, and why is she running for the Senate?" It's not very complicated. She would prefer to do that than go out and get real rich. I mean, that's basically—she would prefer to do this work than even be a wonderful commentator and talk about it. Arguably, in the modern world, people who have access to communications can influence more people because they can just talk to a lot of people and convince them to go change their behavior. Not

her, man. She thinks she's supposed to show up for the job, do it in the old-fashioned way—bam, bam, bam. That's what she believes.

All I can tell you is, I've been around a lot of people, and I've never seen anybody that I thought had the gift for public service that she does. And so what she's got to do is work like crazy and just keep meeting people in New York, and basically chip away at the people who are still questioning, "Well, why is she doing this?" And at some point between now and election day, a critical mass of people will have been reached, and they will be talking to other people, who will be talking to other people, who will be talking to other people.

Did you read that little book, "The Tipping Point?" Have you all read that, how little things make big changes? At some point, we'll reach the tipping point in this whole issue, and it will vanish, and I think she'll be elected. But she can only do it if we can get our message out, which is why it's so important.

So, anyway, that's my pitch. You've got a good Senator. You've got a good Presidential candidate. It's a big election. There are big differences, and I do want you to know what they are.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:30 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to Wayne LaPierre, executive vice president, National Rifle Association; Representative Rick Lazio; and Gov. George W. Bush of Texas.

Executive Order 13159—Blocking Property of the Government of the Russian Federation Relating to the Disposition of Highly Enriched Uranium Extracted From Nuclear Weapons

June 21, 2000

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601

et seq.), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code.

I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, in view of the policies underlying Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, and Executive Order 13085 of May 26, 1998, find that the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation constitutes an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, and hereby declare a national emergency to deal with that threat.

I hereby order:

Section 1. A major national security goal of the United States is to ensure that fissile material removed from Russian nuclear weapons pursuant to various arms control and disarmament agreements is dedicated to peaceful uses, subject to transparency measures, and protected from diversion to activities of proliferation concern. As reflected in Executive Order 13085, the full implementation of the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Russian Federation Concerning the Disposition of Highly Enriched Uranium Extracted from Nuclear Weapons, dated February 18, 1993, and related contracts and agreements (collectively, the "HEU Agreements") is essential to the attainment of this goal. The HEU Agreements provide for the conversion of approximately 500 metric tons of highly enriched uranium contained in Russian nuclear weapons into low-enriched uranium for use as fuel in commercial nuclear reactors. In furtherance of our national security goals, all heads of departments and agencies of the United States Government shall continue to take all appropriate measures within their authority to further the full implementation of the HEU Agreements.

Sec. 2. Government of the Russian Federation assets directly related to the implementation of the HEU Agreements currently may be subject to attachment, judgment, decree, lien, execution, garnishment, or other judicial process, thereby jeopardizing the full implementation of the HEU Agreements to the detriment of U.S. foreign policy. In order

to ensure the preservation and proper and complete transfer to the Government of the Russian Federation of all payments due to it under the HEU Agreements, and except to the extent provided in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may hereafter be issued pursuant to this order, all property and interests in property of the Government of the Russian Federation directly related to the implementation of the HEU Agreements that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches, are hereby blocked and may not be transferred, paid, exported, withdrawn, or otherwise dealt in. Unless licensed or authorized pursuant to this order, any attachment, judgment, decree, lien, execution, garnishment, or other judicial process is null and void with respect to any property or interest in property blocked pursuant to this order.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this order: (a) The term “person” means an individual or entity;

(b) The term “entity” means a partnership, association, trust, joint venture, corporation, or other organization;

(c) The term “United States person” means any United States citizen; permanent resident alien; juridical person organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including foreign branches; or any person in the United States; and

(d) The term “Government of the Russian Federation” means the Government of the Russian Federation, any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, and any person owned or controlled by, or acting for or on behalf of, the Government of the Russian Federation.

Sec. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy, and, as appropriate, other agencies, is hereby authorized to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to me by IEEPA, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this order. The Secretary of the Treasury may redelegate any of these functions to other officers

and agencies of the United States Government. All agencies of the United States Government are hereby directed to take all appropriate measures within their statutory authority to carry out the provisions of this order.

(b) Nothing contained in this order shall relieve a person from any requirement to obtain a license or other authorization from any department or agency of the United States Government in compliance with applicable laws and regulations subject to the jurisdiction of the department or agency.

Sec. 5. This order is not intended to create, nor does it create, any right, benefit, or privilege, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, officers, or any other person.

Sec. 6. (a) This order is effective at 12:01 a.m. eastern daylight time on June 22, 2000.

(b) This order shall be transmitted to the Congress and published in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 21, 2000.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., June 23, 2000]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 22, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on June 26.

Message to the Congress on the National Emergency With Respect to the Russian Federation

June 21, 2000

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(b) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1631, I hereby report that I have exercised my authority to declare a national emergency to deal with the threat posed to the United States by the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation in the Russian Federation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material. The United States and the

Russian Federation have entered into a series of agreements that provide for the conversion of highly enriched uranium (HEU) extracted from Russian nuclear weapons into low enriched uranium (LEU) for use in commercial nuclear reactors. The Russian Federation recently suspended its performance under these agreements because of concerns that payments due to it under these agreements may be subject to attachment, garnishment, or other judicial process, in the United States. Accordingly, I have issued an Executive Order to address the unusual and extraordinary risk of nuclear proliferation created by this situation.

A major national security goal of the United States is to ensure that fissile material removed from Russian nuclear weapons pursuant to various arms control and disarmament agreements is dedicated to peaceful uses, subject to transparency measures, and protected from diversion to activities of proliferation concern. The United States and the Russian Federation entered into an international agreement in February 1993 to deal with these issues as they relate to the disposition of HEU extracted from Russian nuclear weapons (the "HEU Agreement"). Under the HEU Agreement, 500 metric tons of HEU will be converted to LEU over a 20-year period. This is the equivalent of 20,000 nuclear warheads.

Additional agreements were put in place to effectuate the HEU Agreement, including agreements and contracts on transparency, on the appointment of executive agents to assist in implementing the agreements, and on the disposition of LEU delivered to the United States (collectively, the "HEU Agreements"). Under the HEU Agreements, the Russian Federation extracts HEU metal from nuclear weapons. That HEU is oxidized and blended down to LEU in the Russian Federation. The resulting LEU is shipped to the United States for fabrication into fuel for commercial reactors. The United States monitors this conversion process through the Department of Energy's Warhead and Fissile Material Transparency Program.

The HEU Agreements provide for the Russian Federation to receive money and uranium hexafluoride in payment for each shipment of LEU converted from the Rus-

sian nuclear weapons. The money and uranium hexafluoride are transferred to the Russian Federation executive agent in the United States.

The Russian Federation recently suspended its performance under the HEU Agreements because of concerns over possible attachment, garnishment, or other judicial process with respect to the payments due to it as a result of litigation currently pending against the Russian Federation. In response to this concern, the Minister of Atomic Energy of the Russian Federation, Minister Adamov, notified Secretary Richardson on May 5, 2000, of the decision of the Russian Federation to halt shipment of LEU pending resolution of this problem. This suspension presents an unusual and extraordinary threat to U.S. national security goals due to the risk of nuclear proliferation caused by the accumulation of weapons-usable fissile material in the Russian Federation.

The executive branch and the Congress have previously recognized and continue to recognize the threat posed to the United States national security from the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of weapons-usable fissile material in the Russian Federation. This threat is the basis for significant programs aimed at Cooperative Threat Reduction and at controlling excess fissile material. The HEU Agreements are essential tools to accomplish these overall national security goals. Congress demonstrated support for these agreements when it authorized the purchase of Russian uranium in 1998, Public Law 105-277, and also enacted legislation to enable Russian uranium to be sold in this country pursuant to the USEC Privatization Act, 42 U.S.C. 2297h-10.

Payments made to the Russian Federation pursuant to the HEU Agreements are integral to the operation of this key national security program. Uncertainty surrounding litigation involving these payments could lead to a long-term suspension of the HEU Agreements, which creates the risk of nuclear proliferation. This is an unacceptable threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

Accordingly, I have concluded that all property and interests in property of the government of the Russian Federation directly related to the implementation of the HEU Agreements should be protected from the threat of attachment, garnishment, or other judicial process. I have, therefore, exercised my authority and issued an Executive Order that provides:

- except to the extent provided in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may be issued pursuant to the order, all property and interests in property of the Government of the Russian Federation directly related to the implementation of the HEU Agreements that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or hereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches, are blocked and may not be transferred, paid, exported, withdrawn, or otherwise dealt in;
- unless licensed or authorized pursuant to the order, any attachment, judgment, decree, lien, execution, garnishment, or other judicial process is null and void with respect to any property or interest in property blocked pursuant to the order; and
- that all heads of departments and agencies of the United States Government shall continue to take all appropriate measures within their authority to further the full implementation of the HEU Agreements.

The effect of this Executive Order is limited to property that is directly related to the implementation of the HEU Agreements. Such property will be clearly defined by the regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that will be issued pursuant to this Executive Order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued. The order is effective at 12:01 a.m. eastern daylight time on June 22, 2000.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 21, 2000.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 22.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on the National Emergency With Respect to Iran

June 21, 2000

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 21, 2000.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 22.

Remarks on Departure for Phoenix, Arizona, and an Exchange With Reporters

June 22, 2000

Medicare Prescription Drug Coverage/ Tobacco

The President. Good morning. Before I leave, I would like to make a couple of comments about two questions now before Congress: first, whether to provide a voluntary prescription drug benefit to Medicare beneficiaries; and second, whether to hold tobacco companies, not taxpayers, accountable for the costs of tobacco.

Both issues require a bipartisan response. Both are important to the health of our people. Both require Congress—for the public interest, not the special interest. That's especially true when it comes to our seniors and their need for affordable, dependable prescription drug coverage. I have proposed that all our seniors have that option through Medicare, wherever they live, however sick they may be.

Now, Republicans in Congress say they, too, want a prescription drug benefit. They've even hired pollsters, according to your reports, to teach them all kinds of new words to convince the American people they are in favor of it. But the latest plan doesn't measure up to the rhetoric.

Last night, in a completely party-line vote, the House Ways and Means Committee approved a private insurance benefit that many seniors and many people with disabilities simply will not be able to afford. It's a benefit for the companies who make the drugs, not the seniors who need them most. Moreover, their bill would do nothing for the hospitals, home health care agencies, and other providers who clearly need extra help to provide quality care under the Medicare program.

I hope when the full House considers this issue, it will reject this false promise and vote instead for a proposal that provides a real and meaningful Medicare prescription drug benefit on a voluntary basis, but one that is affordable and available to all seniors who need it.

If the House acts to protect the public health, it would be following the fine example it set earlier this week when it permitted the Department of Veterans Affairs to help to fund the Justice Department's litigation against the tobacco companies. This modest investment of VA funds can help our veterans and other taxpayers recover billions of dollars in health care costs, a substantial sum that will improve health care for veterans and for all Americans.

This shows what we can accomplish when we put the public interest ahead of special interests, the public interest ahead of partisan disputes. But it's only a first step. Today the House can move further ahead if it votes to allow the Justice Department to receive these and other funds.

Tuesday's victory for veterans and taxpayers will prove to be hollow if today the House reverses itself. The tobacco companies and their powerful allies in Congress are working overtime to pass special protections to shield them from financial responsibility for the harm they've caused.

So again I ask Congress, just let the American people have their day in court. The legal responsibility of the tobacco companies

should be decided by judicial process, not by the political process. The health of our people is a precious resource.

Those of us in public life should be doing everything we can to work together, whether we're working to provide affordable prescription drug coverage or to demand accountability for the health care costs of tobacco. In the days and months ahead, I will continue to work with members of both parties to achieve these goals.

Thank you very much.

Gasoline Prices

Q. Sir, on gasoline prices, the Vice President was very direct and forthright yesterday, sir, in his accusations that there is collusion among the oil companies to inflate prices. Do you share those sentiments, and what are your thoughts on this becoming a preeminent issue in the Presidential campaign?

The President. Well, first of all, let's look at the problem here. This is a big problem, because there are a lot of Americans that have to drive to make a living. They have to drive distances just to make a living.

Then, you've got all these truckers out there that have to pay big fuel costs to make a living. And something that there hasn't been a lot of talk about, but if this thing can't be moderated, it's also going to have, I think, quite a burdensome impact on the airline companies, on the cost of air travel. So this is going to rife throughout our economy.

I have said repeatedly, and I will say again, I think that it is in the best interest of the people of the United States, but also the oil-producing companies, to have oil prices somewhere in the neighborhood of \$20 to \$25 a barrel. That gives them the revenues they need. It keeps the incentives in our economy to continue to become more energy efficient, and it doesn't bankrupt people that have to have fuel in substantial quantities. So this is a big problem.

Now, I have a lot of concerns about the speed with which this runaway occurred. I expected some upward pressure on prices because our economy is doing well and because the Asian economy is coming back, the European economy is coming back, so there would be a bigger global demand for oil and there would be some upward pressure. But

it doesn't explain, by a long stretch, the dramatic increase in prices. Neither does the requirement for special additives to reduce air pollution even come close to explaining the increase in the Chicago-Milwaukee area. We're talking about 2 or 3 cents a gallon for the environmental requirements, and that won't come close to explaining prices that are 50 cents a gallon higher than they are in other places.

So the proper thing to do, I think, is to have a vigorous inquiry by the Federal Trade Commission; they're going to do this. If you've noticed, there's some indication that the best evidence to support the statement the Vice President made is that 2 days after the call went out for the Federal Trade Commission to investigate this, there was a 16-cent-a-gallon drop in the price of the oil at the refinery level. Now, that hasn't manifested itself at the pump yet, because it takes time for this oil to be refined and to be distributed and to be sold as fuel. But I'm very concerned about it.

Let me say, I guess the follow-up question—and I don't want to anticipate it, but you know, there are all these stories about, well, is this or is this not a political issue, and who does it help or hurt. And I think the important thing is, this country should have a bipartisan or a nonpartisan interest in a long-term, stable energy policy, and there are several things the Congress can do right now to help that. And I would like to just go through them, because I mentioned several of them earlier this year.

But let me just mention—first of all, you will remember I sent a proposal to Congress earlier this year to encourage more stripper well production in the United States. The Congress needs to pass that. We need to get some of these American wells back in operation. Now, the price will make it quite profitable, but we can do some things to jumpstart that.

Secondly, the Congress still has not reauthorized the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which ties the President's hands; it undermines one of the options we have to maintain downward pressure on the oil prices but also to deal with any emergencies that might crop up.

Thirdly, because of the failure to reauthorize the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, there is a cloud over the question of whether we can establish a regional home heating oil reserve for the mid-Atlantic and the Northeastern States that relies so heavily on home heating oil. And if these prices in fuel are any indication and the oil prices stay above \$30 a barrel, we're going to have serious problems in the Northeast this winter unless we have that reserve and we can move home heating oil in there in a hurry.

So let me just go through a couple of other things. Fourthly, I have for years now asked the Congress to fund research and development into alternative energy, into the partnership for new generation vehicles. I have proposed for over 2 years a \$4-billion set of tax incentives for manufacturers and consumers to buy energy-efficient cars, homes, and consumer products. I've proposed a total spending of \$1.4 billion this year for the Department of Energy for renewable energy, for the development of natural gas, for distribution of power methodologies that will save consumers a lot of money. And on balance, Congress has approved about 12 percent of the funds I've asked to be spent for these things that will clearly lower energy bills and help the economy.

And the last thing I would say is, for 2 or 3 years, I've had the electricity restructuring bill up there that we estimate would save consumers in America \$20 billion a year in energy costs by the more efficient distribution and sales of electricity.

So there are things that the Congress can do that I would hope they would do on a bipartisan basis and do quickly that would help us to have a better long-term energy policy and would begin to show immediate benefits for a lot of people who could take advantage of these laws if we could just go ahead and pass them. So we need to do the stripper wells. We need to pass the tax incentives to buy more energy-efficient cars, homes, and other products, and we need to stop spending about 12 percent a year of what we should be spending to develop alternative energy sources. And the electricity restructuring act needs to pass. So those are things we could do together in a bipartisan way to show movement.

Meanwhile, we need an aggressive inquiry by the FTC. There is no economic explanation I can think of for the runup in the prices, particularly in the Middle West, and I want this thing to continue.

Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson

Q. Mr. President, Bill Richardson was grilled pretty badly yesterday by the Republicans, and even Senator Byrd, and they didn't make the Secretary feel very good yesterday. What do you think of the hearing, the way it's done, and do you still have full confidence in Mr. Richardson?

The President. Well, first of all, I think the short answer to your question is, yes, I do. He came in there and faced a whole host of problems, and I think that in every case he's dealt with them in a forthright and aggressive manner. They're getting to the bottom of this last issue, I think, pretty quickly with the help of good work by the FBI and others.

But it's a very serious matter, so the administration should expect to be asked hard questions about it, and we should figure out not only what happened in this case but how to keep such things from happening in the future. You have to expect that you'll have tough congressional hearings when you have something really serious. And I don't have a problem with a tough hearing, but I do have confidence in him. He's worked hard on this, trying to do the right thing.

China Trade Legislation

Q. Mr. President, what is your view of Senator Lott's handling of the China trade bill, and are you concerned that the delay is now endangering chances for final passage?

The President. I was very concerned when I heard that the delay might run into September. Now, I believe we have agreement, as you've seen reported and as you have reported, to bring up the China bill shortly after the Fourth of July recess. Obviously, I wish we could have voted on it before the Fourth of July recess, but there are some issues there. There are some Members in the Senate that want to offer amendments, just like the House, and there's some work to be done.

I met with a group of Senators yesterday, a bipartisan group who will continue to work it hard. But I think we're on schedule now for a timely vote. And I had a good visit with Senator Lott about it, and I think we're on the same page. We're working together, and I look forward to a successful conclusion of this in July.

Midsession Review

Q. In the upcoming midsession review, with the additional budget surplus you're anticipating, are you planning to propose a speedup in the catastrophic coverage under your Medicare prescription drug plan?

The President. I'll have some more to say about that next week when we've got the formal numbers. But let me say, as you have reported, there will be some upward revision in the projections, and that's good news.

I guess in this season we ought to be crowing about it. But we've come a long way over the last 8 years by being prudent. And one of the things that you can be sure I'll do is to reflect a recommendation that the Vice President made, that we wall off—that portion of the surplus due to Medicare taxes like we've walled off that portion due to Social Security taxes so that we can pay down the debt more, and that would protect at least 20 percent of this projected surplus from either being spent or used on tax cuts.

But I think the most important thing you should remember is, we don't have any of that money yet; that's what we think will happen. These are the—keep in mind, when I became President, they were forecasting a \$400-billion budget deficit for this year alone. And we worked very hard to turn that around. We should invest more, we should have a substantial tax cut for our people focused on the things that are most needed. But we shouldn't remember what got us to the dance here. What got us to the dance, what got us to this unbelievable point to have this discussion at all, was discipline—fiscal discipline, arithmetic, being careful, understanding that a projection is just that.

I think it would be a grave error to plan to spend every penny of this, particularly on tax cuts or other things that are so unavoidable because they may not get it back. Now, you can say, "This is my plan for education,"

for example, and if the money doesn't come up, then you don't have to spend it. But if you spend all this in tax cuts or some other mandated fashion on the front end and it doesn't materialize, then you'll be right back into deficits, right back into higher interest rates, and I think, frankly, just the whole legislative process, if that's the track we're on, would lead to an immediate increase in interest rates which would slow the economy down and keep those surpluses from materializing.

So my caution to everybody involved in this is prudence. We got here by being disciplined and prudent. Don't get off of that. Keep paying the debt down, and there will be more money than there would be if you tell everybody how you're going to spend it, and then it doesn't show up.

Q. Won't there be greater room for debt reduction as well as greater tax relief and other changes?

The President. Yes, you can have both, but you can't—but I think it's a mistake to plan to spend it all. Because what are you going to do if it doesn't materialize—particularly if you plan to spend it all on the tax side, because if you do that and the money doesn't materialize, the tax cuts are still on the law.

You can say, "Well, if it comes, I would like to spend it on certain things," and then if it doesn't show up, you don't spend it, because we do the spending every year. So I'll have more to say about it next week when we'll have more time to talk about it in detail.

Colombia

Q. Sir, on Colombia, after the Senate's endorsement last night of the appropriation, are you optimistic that you will get the funding for Operation Colombia before losing so much ground it will be impossible to make it back up?

The President. Well, first, I'd like to compliment the Senate and the bipartisan vote. I'm grateful for it. As you know, there were some differences in the Senate bill and the House bill, first of all, a not insubstantial financial difference—I think about \$300 million over 2 years—and then some differences in how the money would be allocated. But I'm encouraged that we could maybe get the

differences between the Senate proposal and the House proposal worked out.

The second part of your question is really a question that neither I nor anyone else is qualified to answer, that is, it requires conjecture. I think, as I've said all along, sooner is better than later. The quicker we can reach agreement and show that the United States is committed to democracy and to fighting the drug wars in Colombia and to strengthening the oldest democracy in Latin America, the better off we're going to be.

The quicker we do it, the quicker the Colombians will be able to get Europeans and others who are very sympathetic with them to come in and do their part, the more appealing it will be for the international financial institutions.

We haven't had a chance to talk about this much because there are so many other things going on. But those people, they're in the fight of their lives for their very way of life, with the combined pressure of a guerrilla war that's been going on for decades and the rise of the narcotraffickers over the last two decades.

I don't think the average American can imagine what it would be like to live in a country where a third of the country, on any given day, may be in the hands of someone that is an enemy, an adversary of the nation-state. I don't think we can even imagine what that would be like. Just, you know, driving through Washington, DC, and you've got a one-in-three chance of being in a neighborhood that your Government and the law of the land doesn't prevail in. This is a huge, huge issue. And again, I'm grateful to the Senate, and I'm grateful it was done on such a bipartisan basis, and we just need to get it done as quickly as possible.

Now, on Monday or so, I'll be back with something on the midsession review and we'll have a chance for more questions next week.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the South Portico at the White House.

Remarks at a Federal Victory Fund Reception in Phoenix, Arizona

June 22, 2000

Thank you very much. I appreciate the standing ovation. [*Laughter*] Let me say I'm delighted to be back in Arizona again. If you only knew how many times I complained that I wasn't coming out here enough, you'd really be impressed. [*Laughter*] I love coming here.

I want to say, in his absence, that Bruce Babbitt has done a magnificent job as Secretary of the Interior, and I'm very proud of him. We had some rocky issues in the first couple of years, and we still do some things that our friends in the Republican Party don't agree with. But we decided together—and we've been friends for many years because we served as Governors together—that all these emerging issues in the West, the challenges of reconciling all this growth with the environmental challenges, basically were ignored by the other party when they were in power. And they normally did well in the elections because the Federal Government wasn't getting in anybody's hair. And then when the Democrats got in, they tended to try to deal with them, but in a way that alienated so many people we found—further behind. So we decided that we would not ignore them, but we'd try to do it in a way that would make connections with people at the grassroots level. And I think, by and large, the strategy has worked, and I'm very grateful.

We set aside, among other things, more land in national monuments, in the 43 million roadless acres of the national forests, otherwise, than any administration in the history of this country except those of Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt. And I'm very proud of that. And you should be proud of him.

I want to thank the gentleman to my left—to your left, my right—Ed Rendell, the former mayor of Philadelphia who has been a great chair of our Democratic Party and who was leading us to victory this year. And I really thank him for doing that. I decided he ought to be chair of the party when Al Gore and I won Philadelphia with about 80 percent of the vote and a bigger margin than President Kennedy did when it was a much larger city. So I figured if he could work that

kind of mathematical magic in Philadelphia, there's no telling what he could do with the country as a whole. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Steve for his long friendship and Janet for her outstanding leadership. I also want to thank her publicly—I've never had a chance to do this before—for her sterling service as United States attorney here in my first term, before she became the attorney general.

I want to acknowledge the event cochairs here, John Shacknai, Bob and Carolyn Wolf, Delbert and Jewell Lewis, and Fred DuVal, who is much missed in the White House, but I thank him for what he did. And let's give them all a big hand. [*Applause*]

Now, I also want to say a heartfelt thanks to one present and one former Member of Congress, Ed Pastor and former Senator Dennis DeConcini. I think I'm going to see them sometime today. I don't know if they're in this room, but they really did a lot to help ensure the success that this country has enjoyed in the last 7½ years.

I will be brief, but I want to say some things as succinctly as I can. First, I am more grateful than you know that in 1996 we won the electoral votes of Arizona, for the first time since Harry Truman in 1948.

Second, I am profoundly grateful for the success our country has enjoyed in these last 7½ years, that Steve and Janet outlined. I've worked real hard to try to turn this country around and move it in the right direction. And I think we were helped by the fact that I had been a Governor for nearly a dozen years, that I had dealt with most of the problems that the country was facing in 1992, and that we actually had specific, clear ideas about what we wanted to do and we laid them before the American people in great detail.

And that brings me to the present moment. Everybody knew what the problem was in 1992. The wheel was about to run off. The economy was in bad shape. The society was deteriorating by most indicators, and we knew what we had to do. We also knew that Washington was just paralyzed by this sort of partisan fight when basically people would say, "You got an idea; I've got an idea. Let's fight; otherwise, neither one of us will get on the evening news." And so there was

a real penalty put on thinking. If you thought you had new ideas and you tried to work things out, there was really no reward. And most of us out on the country, whether we lived in Arizona or Arkansas or someplace else, thought that it didn't make much sense. So we set about trying to turn the country around, and the results have been good.

But now we're in a new election season. And people ask me all the time, "Well, who's going to win? Do you think the Vice President is going to win?" I say yes. "Do you think Hillary is going to win?" I say yes. And I do, on both counts. "Do you think the Democrats will win back to Congress?" Of course, I say yes. But here's the real truth: Who will win this election depends upon, more than anything else, what the people of America think the election is about. The question you ask may determine the answer you get.

So that's what I want to say to all of you, because when I leave, somebody might ask you why you were here today and what you intend to do. And there's a lot of work for you to do between now and November, and you have to decide what you think the election is about. The election in 1992 was about what we were going to do to turn our country around. In 1996 it was about whether we would continue and build on that direction and build our bridge to this new century. This election is about, in my view, what do we intend to do with our prosperity.

And I would argue to you that what a country does at a magic moment like this is just as stern a test of its judgment and its character as what a country does when it's in trouble. Anybody in this audience today, who is over 30 years of age at least, can cite at least one time in your life when you made a mistake, a personal or a professional mistake, not because things were so tough but because things were so good you thought there was no penalty for the failure to concentrate and think about the long run.

Now, for me, what we ought to do with our prosperity is take advantage of it, because nothing lasts forever—nothing bad, nothing good, nothing lasts forever. So take advantage of this moment to build the future of our dreams for our children, to deal with the big challenges: to deal with the aging of

America, to deal with the plain environmental challenges that are out there because of the way we have grown as a nation and as a world, to deal with the challenge of giving all of our children a world-class education.

And while I'm at it, I'd like to compliment the legislators. It seems to me like there's a bipartisan majority in Arizona for really doing something significant about the schools, and I hope it will get through the legislature. And I want to thank the Republicans who are supporting—[*applause*].

What are we going to do to help all these families who now have jobs balance work and family? Our country is behind other countries in that. You'd be amazed how many parents I talk to, whether they're working for minimum wage or whether they're making six-figure incomes, who worry every single day about how they're going to meet their responsibilities at work and meet their most important responsibilities of raising their children.

There are all these really big, interesting challenges. The reason that I want the Vice President to win, apart from my personal loyalty to him and the role that he's played—and he has been, by far, the most significant Vice President in the history of the country. No other Vice President—I'm a pretty good student of American history, and this is not just election-year hype—no other Vice President has ever had anything close to the positive impact on the affairs of America and the lives of the American people as Vice President than Al Gore has had. Not Harry Truman; not Theodore Roosevelt; not anybody as Vice President.

So when people say, "Why do you think he should be elected?" I say, first of all, because he'll keep the prosperity going. Secondly, because he really wants to extend it to the people and places that have been left behind and aren't fully part of this. And thirdly, because he understands the future, and he can take us there.

We worked very hard to build America's high-tech future because we fought for a technology act, the Telecommunications Act of '96, that was pro-competition and pro-education, with the E-rate that gives discounts so that all of our schools and public libraries

can hook up to the Internet. We've got a very different world today. He understands a big issue that all of you will face sooner or later—probably sooner rather than later—which is, how are we going to preserve people's privacy rights when all of our financial records and all of our health care records are on somebody's computer somewhere? That's just one example.

You need to elect a President now who will keep the prosperity going, who will extend it to people and places left behind, and who understands the future and can lead us there.

Now, I want you to know three things about this election. One, it is really big. It is just as important as the elections of '92 and '96, because we may never have another chance in our lifetime to have a moment where there is so much economic prosperity, social progress, and relative absence of domestic crisis or foreign threat. So it's important.

Two, there are real differences between the parties, from the Presidential candidates to the Senate candidates to the House candidates—real differences—and that's good. It means we can have an exciting and fundamentally positive election. We've had too many elections in the last 20 years where both candidates tried to convince the voters that their opponents were just a notch above a car thief. And you don't have to do that. You can assume in this election that everybody is honorable, that everybody is going to try to do what they say they're going to do, and there are differences. So, one, it's important; two, there are differences.

The third thing you need to know is, only the Democrats want you to know what the differences are. *[Laughter]* For example, there is no question that it will be very appealing for the Republicans, beginning with the nominee for President, to say, "Hey, vote for us, and we'll give you a tax cut worth over a trillion dollars over the next 10 years. And we can easily afford it because we're going to have such a big surplus, because it's projected."

And we say—the Vice President said last week—"No, no, no. First of all, let's start by saving 20 percent of the projected surplus by taking the taxes you pay for Medicare and

putting it in a lockbox so it can't be spent on anything besides Medicare. We'll pay the debt down until we need it, and we'll have a hedge in case this surplus doesn't materialize. And, yes, let's have a tax cut, but let's focus it on the people who really need it and on their need to educate their children, to pay for child care, to pay for long-term care, to accumulate wealth and save for their own retirement."

But let's not spend it all, because if you pass a tax cut now based on an assumed surplus—it's self-serving for me; I ought to say, "Of course we're going to have a multi-trillion dollar surplus over the next 10 years, and I produced it, ha-ha." But the truth is, you don't know any more than I do whether we're going to have all that money over the next 10 years. And I think—people ask me all the time, "What great economic innovation did you bring to Washington?" And I give a one-word answer: arithmetic. *[Laughter]* We brought arithmetic back. We said, "Look, if we don't have it, we shouldn't spend it. We've got to get rid of the deficit. We've got to pay the debt down."

Now, the Democrats should be for, yes, investing in education; yes, giving working people tax breaks; yes, investing in the environment and scientific research. We should be for all that. But we should also be for continuing to pay down the debt. Why? Because it will keep interest rates lower. It will stave off inflation. It will keep the stock market growing. It will keep the economy stronger. We need to do it.

You don't know any more than I do whether all this money that we now project is going to be there over the next 10 years. And if we give it away all on the front end in a tax cut, you know as well as I do, if it doesn't materialize, we'll be right back into the bad old days of deficits. Big issue. So you can't pretend that there are no consequences here. And if you want this thing to keep going, prudence, arithmetic, relying on human experience is really important.

I'll just give you a couple of other examples. We're for the minimum wage, and they're not. We're for a real Patients' Bill of Rights; a few of them are, but most of them aren't. We believe you can grow the economy

and improve the environment in the information age. It is no longer necessary for a country to stay rich or grow rich by putting more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. Most of them don't believe that, but I do. And I believe the evidence is clear.

Vice President Gore said the other day, "Vote for me, and I will build on and strengthen President Clinton's declaration of over 40 million roadless acres in our national forests." In the primary—something that the Republicans hope you'll develop amnesia about—[*laughter*]*—in the primary, his opponent said, "Vote for me, and I'll get rid of that order protecting those 43 million roadless acres."* There's a real difference.

So there are real differences. And what I want—what I would like to ask you to do is go out to the people who aren't here, people you talk to every day, people that might not be Democrats—independents, Republicans—people with money, middle class people that spend everything they earn paying their bills every 2 weeks, people that work in this hotel and have to struggle to pay their bills—and talk to them about it, and say, "Look, this is a gift, folks. We can have an old-fashioned American election. We don't have to be swayed by 30-second ads saying that this person's bad or that person's bad. Let's assume everybody's honorable and that they'll do what they say they're going to do." And get the differences out there, and ask people to think about what they think this is about.

I have done everything I could to leave our country in good shape. And I just want us to take advantage of this moment to build a future we dream of for the kids that are in this audience. And if we do that, then the outcome will be clear, here and throughout America.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:30 p.m. in Salon 2/3 at the Ritz Carlton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to reception cohost Steve Owens; Janet Napolitano, Arizona attorney general, who introduced the President; and Gov. George W. Bush of Texas.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Luncheon in Phoenix

June 22, 2000

Thank you, Fred. Thanks for the great work you did at the White House. Thanks for this today. Thank you, Steve. And to all of you who contributed and raised money and made this a success, I thank you.

I want to thank Mayor Rendell. Remember that old joke about W.C. Fields, he said he wanted on his tombstone, "All things considered, I'd rather be in Philadelphia"? [*Laughter*] Mayor Rendell would always rather be in Philadelphia. But he's seen a great deal of America here, and he's done a great job for us.

I also want to introduce Congressman Bob Filner and his wife, Jane, from San Diego, who's here with us today. I'm glad to see you. They're taking me to San Diego after I leave you.

I know about half of you were in the other room, and I'm loath to repeat my speech—although I'm reminded once I went to—I once went to a concert when I was Governor of Arkansas that Tina Turner held in Little Rock. And the guy that ran the place where we had the concerts knew that I was a huge Tina Turner fan. And so was Hillary, and she was out of town, and she was really steamed that she couldn't go. So I took six of our friends, and I went to this Tina Turner concert.

And she was just making her big comeback, and she sang all these new songs. Then at the very end of the concert she started—the band started playing "Proud Mary," which was her first hit, and we'd all heard it before. And so Tina Turner goes up to the microphone, everybody cheers like crazy, and she said, "You know I've been singing this song for 25 years, but it gets better every time I do it." [*Laughter*] So maybe I should just give the same speech I just gave. [*Laughter*]

I want to say to all of you how much I have loved coming here to Arizona and working with the people here on a wide variety of issues; how grateful I am for the service of all the Arizonans in the administration, including Fred and Bruce and Hattie, and all

the others; and how profoundly grateful I am that we actually won Arizona's electoral votes for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

I want to say a special word of appreciation to the Native American tribal leaders who are here. When I became President, I had spent a lot of time—and so had Hillary, actually—going out into Indian country, across America. And first of all, there is no monolith there. Some of the tribes have great wealth and success because of their gaming operations, and some of them have diversified into operations. Others, including the Navajos in northern New Mexico, up near the Colorado border, the Lakota Sioux in southern South Dakota, are still so physically isolated that more than half the people are unemployed. In some places, more than half the people don't have telephones. And the relationship between our National Government and the Native American tribes, in my judgment, have never really been as it should have been, and certainly has never been consistent with the promises we made in return for all the land and minerals and other things that we took so long ago.

So, shortly after I became President in 1994, I invited all the tribal leaders in America to come to the White House, for the first time since James Monroe was President in the 1820's. And we had an incredible day there. But it was very instructive for the senior members of my administration because we had people who could fly in on their private jets, and other people where the tribal members had to pass the hat to raise enough money to buy an airplane ticket.

And I just say that to you here in Arizona because we have to keep working on this. We have come a long way. We've made a lot of progress. We've done a lot in education. I've got an economic initiative out there that I think we'll pass this year, that I believe will make a big difference. But we have a lot of work to do. And we are beginning to build—I'm happy to say, we're beginning slowly to build some bipartisan coalition for building the right kind of commitment to empowerment and equality. And I thank you all for being here, and I think the Vice President will show up at your —[inaudible].

I would like to also say that a lot of people are—when I go to these events, people say, thank you, and I look around and wonder if they're talking about somebody that's still breathing. [Laughter] And so—I got a great call the other day from a very distinguished gentleman who said, "You know, Mr. President, for a lame duck you're still quacking quite loudly." [Laughter] I like that.

We're trying to get a lot of things done, but we're also in an election. And I just want to give you a couple of observations. First of all, insofar as we have had any success over these last 7½ years, the real credit belongs to the people of this country for supporting us and for what they do outside the Government sphere all day, every day, and to the fact that I think we had good ideas. People come up to me all the time, and they say, "Gosh, you really brought a certain political skill to the office." And I said, "What difference does it make? If we had the wrong ideas, we wouldn't be where we are." It really matters what your ideas are and whether you can turn those ideas into policy.

And Janet Napolitano said in the previous event something that I really appreciated very much. She talked about the work I did in 1990, when I had no idea that I would be here, to write a document for the Democratic Party through the Democratic Leadership Council, that said, okay, here's where we think America is; here's what our core values are; here are the specific things we would do if we had a chance to govern.

Really it's like, being President's not all that different from any other job. It matters how hard you work, and it matters whether what you're working on is right. And I say that because we're so fortunate this year to have such a good set of circumstances in the country, although we are reminded to be a little humble about it—like the gas price rises in the Middle West, there should be a little reminder that there's no such thing as a static reality. Things are changing in this country very rapidly, and in the whole world.

But we're very fortunate. And the only thing that I really worry about is whether we kind of get lulled to sleep in the midst of our own prosperity and progress and think that there are no serious consequences to this

election. This election is every bit as important as the elections of 1992 and 1996.

In '92 we all knew what we had to do; we had to change something. We not only had to change the economic and social policies of the country; we had to change the way politics works, because Washington had virtually become paralyzed in the shouting match between the two political parties. I'd sit home in Little Rock and look at the news at night, and it appeared to me that the paradigm for how it was working was something like, I've got my idea, you've got your idea; let's fight. Because if we don't fight, neither one of us will get on the evening news. Now, we won't get anything done, but we might get on the evening news.

And I was stunned that when I became President and I started trying to implement some of our ideas, say, for welfare reform, people would say, "Well you can't do that. That's supposed to be a Republican idea." And I'd say, "Well, what is that?" And there was never any substance; it was just like a tag. And if you had the tag, whether it was crime or welfare reform, that was a Republican tag. If it was education or health care, that was a Democratic tag. And that doesn't tell you very much. That's just a category. That's a word; you have to give meaning to it.

So we've really worked very hard in the last 7½ years to actually show up every day, have ideas, and try to implement them. And it's amazing; it's like any other kind of job. It actually yields to effort. And I say that because it's very important to me, as someone who is not a candidate for the first time in more than a quarter-century, that you understand that this is a really, really significant decision that is in your hands. And that we are very fortunate to be able to make this decision at a good time for our country.

And I hope we will make it in a very positive way, which doesn't mean that I don't think there ought to be any fights and arguments. That's what elections are for. Then you have to do your best to govern after the election. But I've been so troubled, in the last 20 years, how many elections seem to have revolved around both sides, as I said in the other meeting, trying to convince the voters that their opponents were just one

notch above a car thief. And the truth is, if you look at the whole history of American politics, Presidents pretty much do what they say they're going to do when they run. And when they don't do it, we're normally glad they didn't. *[Laughter]*

I'll give you an example. Aren't you glad that Abraham Lincoln didn't keep his campaign promise in 1860 not to free the slaves? Aren't we glad that—he basically said, "My commitment is to limit slavery, but I won't try to free them." And he got in the middle of the Civil War, and he realized that in good conscience, it was wrong. At least three times a week, I walk into the room in the White House where Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, and thank God that he changed his mind.

Aren't you glad that Roosevelt didn't keep his campaign promise in 1932? Look at Bert laughing over there—he brought me a Roosevelt letter the last time I was here, so I could read it. And he promised in '32 that if he got elected, he'd balance the budget. Well, it was a good thing for me to promise, but a very bad thing for Roosevelt to promise, because the unemployment rate of the country was 25 percent. And if he'd balanced the budget, it would have made the economy worse. So, instead, he experimented until he found something that was working. But by and large, people do what they say they will do.

One of the nicest things that I have read—and I have read some things about myself that weren't so nice, as you might imagine—*[laughter]*—but one of the nicest things that I've read—way back in '95, when we were in political trouble, a distinguished Presidential scholar of the Presidency and the media named Thomas Patterson did an analysis of our record and said that I had already kept a higher percentage of my campaign commitments than the previous five Presidents, even though I made more of them.

I say that—the people on our side, we took these ideas seriously. We took these policies seriously. We really worked at them. And this is—I'm not giving you a slogan or a 30-second ad, but I'm saying how I hope you will approach this election. We can approach the election and say, "Okay, we've got two candidates for President that are honorable

people. We have candidates for the Senate and the House that are honorable people. Let's tee it up and see what they expect to do with this magic moment."

The most important thing for the Democrats is that people understand how important the election is. We knew what the deal was in '92, and we knew it was real important. We had a huge turnout. The country was flat on its back. But I say this over and over again, but I'm going to say it again—there's not a person in the world over 30 years old that cannot remember at least one instance when you made a personal or a professional mistake, not because things were so bad, but because things were so good that you thought there was no consequence to the failure to concentrate. There is nobody who has lived very long who can't remember at least once when that happened to you. That is what we have to avoid.

If we understand that this is like the moment of a lifetime, and then we say, okay, what are we going to do with our prosperity, I hope the answer is: big things. It's a chance to paint the future that we all want for our children.

How are we going to deal with the aging of America? When all the baby boomers like me get in the retirement system there will be two people working for every one person drawing Social Security. How will we manage that? Both candidates have an idea about Social Security; the Vice President said more about Medicare. Who's right?

How are we going to grow the economy and deal with the challenges of the local environment, where you have a lot of growth, and the global environment and global warming, which is real and can change everything about the way our children live? How are we going to be a force for peace and freedom and decency throughout the world and minimize the new security challenges that the young people in this audience will face from chemical, biological, nuclear weapons that, like everything else, will benefit from, unfortunately, new technology and miniaturization? How are we going to give all of our kids a world-class education? How are we going to make sure everybody has got a chance to participate in this economy?

One of the things we are doing in a bipartisan fashion in Washington now is pushing this new markets legislation of mine. I've been on two reservations lately to say that America ought to give people with money the same incentives to invest in poor areas in America we give them to invest in poor areas in Latin America and Asia and Africa—because we'll never have a better chance to bring the benefits of free enterprise to neighborhoods that have been left behind.

See, these are big questions. These are questions—most of these questions we couldn't even ask back in '92 because we were \$300 billion in debt.

Now, so it's a big election, ought to be about big things. As Ed said, there are real differences. I'll just mention three or four. There's a huge difference between the Democratic take on where we are and how to keep the prosperity going, and the Republican take. They think that we ought to have a tax cut that costs somewhere between \$1.3 trillion and \$1.6 trillion. And they say, "Well, the projected surplus is bigger than that." But if you take their Social Security proposal and other things—the missile defense and all those other proposals—it's way more than the projected surplus.

We think—the Vice President said the other day—we ought to take \$400 billion of this projected tax cut, that's going to come right out of the Medicare taxes you pay, and take it out of the budget, save it, wall it off, and use it to pay down the debt until we need it for Medicare. Now, that has two benefits. First of all, you're protecting the money and paying down the debt. Secondly, you're protecting yourself in case all that projected surplus doesn't materialize.

I think it is really a mistake to decide now to spend all of this projected surplus over the next 10 years, which may not materialize. And they say back, "Well, you guys want to spend a lot of it." We do. But the difference is you have to approve the spending bills every year, so if the money is not coming in, you just don't approve the bills. But if you build it all into a tax cut on the front end, it's gone.

So we want a tax cut, too, but we think it ought to be more modest in scope because the main thing we can do for the economy

is to keep these interest rates down, keep paying that debt down, keep this thing going. That's a big difference.

Then what about including people? We think we ought to raise the minimum wage again; they don't. We think we ought to pass a Patients' Bill of Rights; they don't. We think we ought to provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit to every senior at an affordable price on a voluntary basis; and their plan doesn't do that.

Now, you ought to tell your friends out here that are independents and Republicans—you ought to listen to them, hear their side out, let them say why they differ with us. But don't pretend they don't differ. I got a big laugh in the other meeting when I said there are three things you need to know about this election: it's important; there are differences between the candidates and the parties; and only the Democrats want you to know what the differences are. But there's a certain truth to that.

And I think it's important that we have a great, decent, candid, clear national debate without trying to impugn anybody's personality, integrity, but to say this is—we have been given a gift here, and we can talk about it, and we can chart our future. We're not bailing water out of a leaky boat anymore; now we've got a chance to really just think about where we're going.

There are lots of other issues. This country is fast becoming the most multiracial, multi-ethnic, multireligious democratic society in the world. How do we intend to go forward into the future, actually not just tolerating each other but celebrating our differences and feeling secure enough to do it because we know our common humanity is even more important than all of our differences? This is a huge question.

You think about what I have to—how have I spent the time you gave me as President on foreign policy? I worry about Northern Ireland. I worry about the Middle East. I've worried about Kosovo. I've worried about Bosnia. I worry about the tribal wars in Africa. All over the world, in this so-called modern world, people are still out there killing each other because they're from a different tribe, a different faith, a different race, a different ethnic group. And still in America we

have hate crimes where people get killed just because of their race or their religion or because they're gay.

This is a big deal. We've got to figure out—we're not going to be able to do good around the world unless we are good here at home. And we have the opportunity to honestly discuss this. How are we going to get this done now? And you can say, "Well, you can say all this high-minded stuff because you're not running." [Laughter] In the end there will be some 15-second slogan that will pierce to the heart of this. That does not have to be the case. That does not have to be the case.

We had two guys offer, I think—or one man offered the other day a million dollars to the Presidential candidates' favorite charity, \$500,000 each, if they'd just show up and have a debate on nothing but education—and he happens to be a Republican. And the Vice President—I was proud of him—said, "Absolutely, right now, I'll do it."

But I think the more we just sit around and treat each other like we've got half-good sense and we know what we're doing and we talk about what kind of future we want, the better off we're going to be. Now, do I believe it helps the Democrats? You bet I do. Do I think, if that's the environment of the election, Al Gore will be elected, that we'll pick up seats in the Senate, including one I hope in New York, that we'll take the House back? Yes, I do. I think that. But I might be wrong. I trust the American people. Why are we around here after 200 years? Because most of the time we get it right, if we have enough time and enough information. The sort of internal compass of the American people, if it's not threatened, normally comes out all right. That's why we're still around here after all this time.

So that's what I'd like to ask you all to think about. I'd like to ask you to go out and talk to people about it, because there is a lot more consensus on a lot of these issues than I think we think, number one; number two, there are a lot of these issues that nobody has got the answer to, that we need debates on.

I mentioned in the other room—I want to mention again—I was thrilled when I found out that your Republican Governor and the whole Democratic legislature, all the

Democratic legislators were pushing an education initiative to lower class size, raise teacher pay, and improve the quality of education. That's a great thing. Because I can tell you this, if we can't provide a world-class education to all of our kids, then we will never be the country we ought to be.

And I can also tell you that we can do it. I was in a public school in Spanish Harlem in New York the other day. Two years ago 80 percent of those kids were reading below grade level and doing math below grade level. Two years ago. Today, 74 percent of them are at or above grade level—in 2 years.

I was in a little school in Kentucky the other day where way over the half the kids are on free or reduced lunch. They were identified as a failing school that had to do better. They were going to have to shut down or turn around. And in 3 years, they went from 12 percent of their kids reading at or above grade level to 57 percent. They went from 5 percent of their kids doing math at or above grade level to 70 percent. They went from zero percent of their kids doing science at or above grade level to two-thirds of them. And it's one of the 20 best grade schools in Kentucky today—over half the kids from very poor homes.

So we can do this. That's another thing. I'd like to see this debated. I've been working on this school reform business for 20 years. And when we started—when Hillary and I started with the schools at home, we kind of thought we knew what needed to be done, and some of the stuff was obvious. But now, we actually know. Now there are a remarkable number of success stories like this about educating our children. We know how to do it now. There's not a State in America where you can't identify a cluster of schools that were in the tank that are performing at very high levels now. Not a one. So, what's our excuse for the others? That ought to be a big source of debate in this election.

How are we going to close the digital divide? What about the Indian reservations, where half the people don't have phones? I was introduced the other day, on the Navajo Reservation, by a 13-year-old girl that won a contest—and she was very brilliant—and she won a contest; she won a computer.

And she couldn't get on the Internet because there was no phone line in her home.

So who's got the best ideas about what to deal with that? The point I'm trying to make is, there's plenty of stuff to debate. And I don't think the American people would be bored if we had an honest, civil, explicit discussion about the big challenges out there. Now, do I think we would win? You bet I do, in a heartbeat. I believe that. But I might be wrong. We ought to suit up and find out.

And I'll just say this about Al Gore: I think I now know Al Gore better than anybody outside his family. We had lunch once a week, the whole time we've been there together, except when he had something more pressing to do—when he started running for President. And I picked him not only because we shared a certain orientation toward the challenges of the 1990's, but because he had experience in Washington I didn't have, and he knew things about technology and the environment and arms control and foreign policy I didn't know.

And it has been one of the best decisions I ever made in my entire life about anything. And I can tell you, on every tough decision that I had to make—and we made some tough ones—when we decided to help Mexico, something that would have a big effect on Arizona—the Mexican economy, it collapsed a few years ago—the day we did it, there was a poll that said by 81 to 15, you, the American people, thought I shouldn't do it. That was a real tester. *[Laughter]*

But we did it, because I knew it was the right thing to do. And I figured, a poll is like a horse race; it's not over yet. People pay you to win and to do the right thing for the country, and if it comes out all right, it's all right.

But Al Gore was for that. We went into Bosnia and Kosovo; Al Gore was for that. When we went in to save democracy in Haiti, Al Gore was for that. He broke the tie on the economic plan of '93, where we had no votes from the other party. And if it hadn't been for that economic plan passing, the rest of us—we wouldn't be sitting here in this nice hotel having this lunch today.

So he is a person of extraordinary intelligence, extraordinary energy, and like me, he loves all these issues. He also knows a

lot about these technological issues that we're going to have to face. For example, we've got to close the digital divide. Wouldn't you like to have somebody as President who knew how to do it, and who had been working on it for 6 or 7 years?

We've got to deal with the privacy issues. We're all going to have all our records on computers, all our financial records, all our health care records. If you had to put up health care records to get health insurance, don't you think there ought to be some limit to who gets access to them? Shouldn't you have to give your own permission before you give them up? Do you think you ought to be denied a job because somebody can log onto the Internet and find out something about you your first cousin may not know? These are big issues.

So anyway, I realize this is not a traditional political speech; this is a conversation. But you just remember what I told you. It's a real big election, real big issues, honest differences—not bad guys and good guys, honest differences. And if people know what they are, we'll win. That's what you have to help us do.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:10 p.m. in Salon 1 at the Ritz Carlton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to luncheon cohosts Fred DuVal and Steve Owens; Edward G. Rendell, general chair, Democratic National Committee; Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt and his wife, Hattie Babbitt, Deputy Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development; Janet Napolitano, Arizona attorney general; Thomas Patterson, professor of government and the press, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University; and Gov. Jane Dee Hull of Arizona.

Statement on Proposed School Modernization Legislation

June 22, 2000

Every year that Congress stalls on passing critical school modernization legislation is another year our children have to go to class in trailers, in crowded classrooms, in crumbling schools. A new U.S. Department of Education survey of the condition of American schools gives cause for concern. Rising enrollments and years of deferred maintenance

have taken a serious toll, jeopardizing our children's health and the quality of their education. According to the report, our schools require \$127 billion in repairs and 3.5 million students attend school in buildings that need to be replaced altogether.

Children cannot learn in crumbling schools. It is clear that additional resources are needed to accommodate record enrollments and allow smaller classes. I have called on Congress to enact my proposal to repair 25,000 schools over the next 5 years. In addition, I have proposed a school construction tax cut that would help communities build and modernize 6,000 schools. Representatives Charles Rangel and Nancy Johnson have introduced legislation to do just that. While there is broad bipartisan support for this key school modernization legislation, congressional leaders have refused to even bring it to a vote. Congress should act now to give all our children the safe, modern, world-class schools they deserve.

Statement on Proposed Legislation To Bolster Enforcement of Gun Laws

June 22, 2000

Today the House has an opportunity to bolster our efforts to fight gun crime in America as it considers the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill. In its current form, the bill severely underfunds my \$280 million national gun enforcement initiative—including funding for 1,000 new State and local gun prosecutors, anti-gun violence media campaigns, and smart gun technology. I urge the House to pass Representative Lowey's amendment to provide \$150 million to hire State and local gun prosecutors to put more gun criminals behind bars.

Yesterday the Treasury Department released its first-ever gun ATF gun trafficking report demonstrating my administration's commitment to tough gun enforcement and the need to close deadly loopholes in our laws that make gun shows and corrupt dealers favorite supply channels for illegal traffickers. Congress can take immediate action to address these issues and make progress in the fight to reduce gun violence. Instead, the

House attempted to undermine the administration's historic gun safety agreement with Smith & Wesson last night. Despite the failure of this attempt, the Republican leadership continues its assault on this agreement at a time when our Nation loses nearly 12 children per day in gunfire.

We should be doing all we can to move forward in the fight to reduce gun violence, not backward. I urge Congress to focus on measures that will improve public safety by fully funding my national gun enforcement initiative to give law enforcement even more tools to crack down on gun criminals. And Congress should finally pass the stalled commonsense gun safety legislation to close the gun show loophole and take other steps to keep guns out of the wrong hands.

Statement on the Shootings of Government Meat Inspectors

June 22, 2000

I was shocked and saddened to learn of the tragic shootings of three government inspectors, including two U.S. Department of Agriculture employees, in California. The Federal Government is working closely with local authorities on this matter. This grievous act was committed against dedicated individuals who were working to ensure the public's health and safety. I want to join all Americans in extending our thoughts and prayers to the victims and their families and coworkers.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on National Long-Term Energy Needs

June 22, 2000

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Leader:)

With so much attention focused on the recent spike in gasoline prices and OPEC's decision to increase production quotas, it is critical that we not lose sight of our nation's long-term energy needs. For seven years, my Administration has pursued a sound, comprehensive policy to address those needs. Regrettably, several key elements of this Administration's strategy have languished in Congress. In recent days, in fact, budget initiatives to strengthen our energy supply have

suffered significant cuts, while some Members have advanced proposals that would seriously harm our environment in the name of energy security. I urge you to work closely with me to enact these critical energy proposals without further delay.

I remain very concerned about high gasoline prices and find the situation in the Chicago/Milwaukee region particularly troubling. Last week, the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Environmental Protection Agency sent analysts to the region to explore the reasons for this price differential. While a number of factors appear to have contributed to the unusually high prices in the region, it is possible that they may not account for the entire increase in gas prices. The Federal Trade Commission has initiated an investigation of pricing practices in the region to determine if there is any unfair or illegal activity there. We look forward to the results of these investigations.

Our concern about high gasoline prices in the short-term, however, cannot be allowed to distract us from addressing the long-term energy needs of our nation. My Administration has pursued an energy policy that provides a comprehensive and balanced approach to addressing the nation's energy needs. Unfortunately, Congress is considering proposals that are unnecessary and would do irrevocable harm to the environment, such as opening the Arctic refuge to drilling. Instead, Congress should act on the following key pieces of my energy policy.

First, I have proposed a \$4 billion package of tax incentives to encourage consumers to purchase more efficient cars, homes, and consumer products. Congress has failed to enact this package for over two years, even though these tax credits would save consumers money, protect our environment, and reduce our dependence on foreign oil. I also have proposed tax incentives to support renewable energy and the domestic oil industry, including the expensing of geological and geophysical expenses and delay rental payments.

Second, over the past seven years I have repeatedly proposed significant increases in Federal investments in responsible domestic sources of energy, including most recently \$1.4 billion in FY 2001 for high-priority items

at DOE for energy efficiency, renewable energy, natural gas, and distributed power generation systems. Specific examples of these investments include more efficient technologies for our factories and homes, weatherization of low income households, technologies to produce biofuels and power from biomass, and the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles (PNGV)—a collaborative effort with automakers to deliver affordable cars that are three times more fuel efficient. Yet, Congress has failed to support these critical goals, approving only 12 percent of our proposed increases for energy efficiency and renewables over the past seven years. This year, the House has already cut DOE's FY 2001 budget for energy efficiency programs below last year's enacted level and has cut virtually all DOE funding for the PNGV program.

Third, two years ago I submitted the Comprehensive Electricity Restructuring Act to Congress, to improve the operation and efficiency of the electricity sector. Congress to date has not enacted a comprehensive restructuring bill. Such legislation would improve the reliability of our electric power system, provide American consumers an estimated annual savings of \$20 billion as a result of competition in electricity markets, and significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Fourth, to address energy supply emergencies, I have called for reauthorization of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR), the establishment of a regional home heating oil reserve in the Northeast, and replenishment of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program emergency funds. Authorization for the SPR expired on March 31, 2000. It is critical that the SPR be reauthorized so that I have available all means to respond to any possible energy supply emergency. Further, the Department of Energy cannot establish a regional home heating oil reserve in the Northeast to respond to shortages of home heating oil until Congress either reauthorizes the SPR or separately passes legislation authorizing the creation of such a reserve with a responsible trigger. Because Congress has failed to act thus far, it will be virtually impossible to establish a home heating oil reserve in time for next winter.

America needs a balanced, forward-looking energy policy based on the proposals that my Administration has put before Congress. We are committed to a responsible approach that will infuse our energy sector with both efficiency and competition; that values clean air, clean water, and healthy lands; and that seeks to cushion America against emergencies in the energy market. Congress should act on my proposals without further hesitation.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Letters were sent to J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Richard A. Gephardt, House minority leader; Trent Lott, Senate majority leader; and Tom Daschle, Senate minority leader. An original was not available for verification of the content of this letter.

Message to the Senate Transmitting an Amendment to the Montreal Protocol

June 22, 2000

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the "Montreal Protocol"), adopted at Beijing on December 3, 1999, by the Eleventh Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (the "Beijing Amendment"). The report of the Department of State is also enclosed for the information of the Senate.

The principal features of the Beijing Amendment, which was negotiated under the auspices of the United Nations Environment Program, are the addition of trade controls on hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs), the addition of production controls on HCFCs, the addition of bromochloromethane to the substances controlled under the Montreal Protocol, and the addition of mandatory reporting requirements on the use of methyl bromide for quarantine and preshipment purposes. The Beijing Amendment will constitute a major step forward in protecting public health and the environment from potential adverse effects of stratospheric ozone depletion.

By its terms, the Beijing Amendment will enter into force on January 1, 2001, provided that at least 20 parties have indicated their consent to be bound. The Beijing Amendment provides that no State may become a party unless it previously has become (or simultaneously becomes) a party to the 1997 Montreal Amendment. The Montreal Amendment is currently before the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification (Senate Treaty Doc. No. 106–10).

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Beijing Amendment and give its advice and consent to ratification, at the same time as it gives its advice and consent to ratification of the Montreal Amendment.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 22, 2000.

**Remarks at a Reception for
Congressional Candidate Susan
Davis in San Diego, California**

June 22, 2000

Thank you. I'm sorry Susan couldn't be here today, but I'm glad she's doing her job. [Laughter] That's what Democrats do. And I feel really comfortable having Steve here, because we're both campaigning for positions in the congressional spouses' club. [Laughter]

I want to thank Congressman Bob Filner for that rousing speech and for the wonderful service he gives to you, to California, and to our Nation every day in the United States Congress.

Somewhere in this crowd we have two other Democratic candidates for Congress—George Barraza and Craig Barkacs. Where are they? They're here somewhere. Give them a hand. There they are. [Applause] On my way in, the first lady of California, Sharon Davis, met me. I want to thank her for being here.

And I want to say to all of you, thanks. I think all of you know the role that this State played in our campaign in '92 and in '96; the unbelievable vote we got here against all the odds in 1992, when I became the first

Democrat since Harry Truman to carry San Diego, and I thank you.

I just want to say one or two words. You know, I can speak with a certain freedom about this election because it's the first time in 26 years I haven't been on the ballot. [Laughter] Most days, I'm okay about it. [Laughter] I know it's hot in here, and I want to get out and shake hands and all that, but I want you to just listen for a minute. Somebody might ask you why you came here, and I want you to be able to give a good answer.

Now, we have worked hard to turn this country around. And where I could—where I could in good faith, I have worked with the Republicans. But they opposed our economic policy and said it would bankrupt the country. Instead, it gave us the longest economic expansion and the biggest surpluses in our history. They opposed our social policies. They were against the family and medical leave law. They said it would hurt the economy. Instead, we've had over 20 million people take advantage of it when a baby was born or a parent was sick. And we've got over 22 million new jobs. Basically, they opposed us on the Brady bill, the assault weapons ban, putting 100,000 police on the street, putting 50,000 more on the street. They said it wouldn't put a dent in crime. Instead, it gave us the lowest crime rate in 25 years and a 35 percent drop in crime.

They kept trying to put these riders to weaken our environmental protection on all the bills that I passed, ever since 1995. They opposed it when I tried to set aside national monuments, when I set aside over 40 million acres for roadless areas in the national forests. They said all of our efforts to have cleaner air, cleaner water, were going to hurt the economy. Instead, we've got the strongest economy and the cleanest environment in history.

Now, what's the point of all this? We have had a contest of ideas. And that's what you have to remind the voters of this November, the people who aren't here, the people who don't follow this so closely, but the people who love our country and love this State and want to do right by America when they go into the voting booth. We have had a contest

of ideas. Ours have been tested in the crucible of experience, and guess what? They worked. They worked.

I recommend you go out all across this community and to your friends all across the State and throughout the Nation and say the following: Number one, this is a really important election. It is just as important as the election of 1992 or the election of 1996. And the danger is that people may not understand it. In '92 California was hurting; the economy was hurting; the open wounds of society were laid bare. We knew what the election was about. We knew we had to change. In 1996 the election was clear: Were you going to ratify what we were doing or reject it and build our bridge to the 21st century?

What is the election of 2000 about? It is about, what do we propose to do with our prosperity, with our surplus, with our good fortune, with our social progress, with our confidence? That's what it's about. I believe with all my heart, if the American people believe that's what this election about, we'll win. I believe Al Gore will win. I believe Susan Davis will win. I believe Hillary Clinton will win. I believe—[inaudible].

Here's the good news. You don't have to go out and say anything bad. All you've got to do is tell the truth about the differences. I'm sick and tired of elections—for 20 years, I have watched elections—mostly driven by the far right in this country—where, in the end, people were so angry and upset with each other, both sides were essentially trying to convince the voters that their opponents were just one notch above a car thief. [Laughter]

Now, you don't have to do it, and you shouldn't. What you ought to say, number one, this is a big election; we've got the chance to build the future of our dreams for our children. Number two, there are real differences and they are profound, and you should assume that people on both sides are honorable, and they will continue to do what they have done, and they will do exactly what they say they will do. And number three, only the Democrats want you to know what the real differences are in this election.

You watch—I'll tell you, I love watching these Republicans now, butter wouldn't melt in their mouth. They want you to forget all

about the fact that they even had a Presidential primary campaign. And they certainly want you to forget the commitments they made in their primary campaign. And you watch a lot of them voting this year—they want you to forget all about how they voted from 1995 until they figured out where the voters were. And they figured they could just get by this election and they could go back to being the way it was.

Now look, there are real differences. On economic policy, they want to take all this marvelous projected—the operative word is projected—surplus and spend it on their plan for a tax cut, \$1.3 to \$1.5 trillion; on their plan to partially privatize Social Security, which would cost about \$800 billion. They want to spend more for their missile defense system and their other defense ideas and for their school voucher program. In other words, they want to spend it all now because they know it's going to materialize.

Now, I ought to say that it will because it's self-serving for me. We turned this deficit around, and we got a projected, huge surplus. But I say again, it is projected.

Now, what Al Gore and the Democrats want to do is to, first of all, say it's projected; we don't have this money yet. How in the world can we give it all away before we've got it? Let's save 20 percent on the front end by taking all the taxes you pay for Medicare and putting it over here so it can't be spent on anything else, and keep paying down the debt. Let's give the people a tax cut but one they really need to help educate our children, send them to college, pay for child care, pay for long-term care for the elderly, pay to give people incentives to invest in the poor areas that have been left behind. But let's make sure it's something we can afford, even if what is projected doesn't materialize. And let's save some back to invest in the education of our children and cleaning up the environment and extending health care coverage to people who need it.

Now, folks, this is a huge deal. Do you want the main benefits of this surplus we worked so hard for to go to just a few, and do you want to risk the fact that we'll be back in deficits before you know it? Or do you want to keep paying the national debt

down and investing in the future of our children and our families?

You know, now that I've just got about 7 months to go, all these people come up to me all the time and say, "What was the secret of your economic policy? What did you bring back to Washington? What new idea did you introduce?" And I give them a one-word answer—arithmetic. We tried their way for 12 years; we tried it our way for 8 years. Does anybody seriously doubt which way works best? Let's don't go back to that old way. Let's go forward.

Now, what about building one America? We're for a minimum wage increase, they're not. Only now they feel bad about it when they're not. [*Laughter*] We're for a Patients' Bill of Rights, and they're not. Only now they act like they feel bad about it when they're not. [*Laughter*] We're for a Medicare voluntary prescription drug program so that all of our seniors have access to prescription drugs, they're not. Only now they have posters to tell them what words they're supposed to say so you'll think they're for it. [*Laughter*]

Now, I'm not the most partisan person we ever had in the White House. I like working with Republicans. I will work with Republicans every day until I leave if they'll work with me. But I'm not going to paper over the differences, and you shouldn't either. There are real differences here—on economic policy, on Medicare and prescription drugs, on the Patients' Bill of Rights, on the minimum wage, on whether we're going to protect the environment or weaken our environmental protections, on whether the next Supreme Court will protect a right to choose or get rid of it.

So I'm here for Susan Davis because I think she's on the right side of those issues, and because she has worked hard at a public job and represented you well. And she's doing her duty today, which is what she ought to be doing. And that's what we need more of in this country.

And I'm here for Al Gore because I know he will have an economic policy that will keep the prosperity going. You ought to ask—I just want you to ask your friends in California and throughout the country if they really want to go back to that economic policy or

wouldn't they like to build on what we've done and go forward? That's the first thing.

Second thing, I'm for him because I know he will try to extend the benefits of this prosperity to the families of people in the places that have been left behind, which is a passion of mine. If we can't take economic opportunity to the poor neighborhoods, the poor people, and the poor places that have been left behind now; if we can't close the digital divide; if we can't raise educational opportunity—if we can't do this now, when will we ever get around to it? Now is not the time to change our commitment to spreading the benefits of this new economy.

And the final thing, the third reason I'm for him is that he understands the future. And we need somebody in Office who understands the future. There will be all kinds of new issues. The children in this audience will spend the next 30 years worrying about global warming if we don't take action now. And Al Gore was the first public figure in American life to understand that. When everybody else was saying it was some sort of conspiracy to undermine the American economy, he said, "No, the climate is getting warmer, and it's going to wreck a lot of what we do and a lot of how we live, and we can still grow our economy and improve our environment."

When we rewrote the telecommunications law in a way that created hundreds of thousands of jobs, all the big monopolists moved in on Congress, and Al Gore said, "No, we're going to have competition here; we're going to let small entrepreneurs and little guys get in here and take advantage of this technological revolution. And we're going to have the E-rate so that every school and every library can afford to log onto the Internet, and none of our kids will be left behind."

And now, when all of our health records and all of our financial records are on somebody's computer somewhere, and a lot of big economic interests want to get their hands on it—for obvious reasons. Al Gore is up there in Washington saying, "No, Americans should have the right to privacy. And unless they say you can have their information, you shouldn't get their health or their financial information."

So I want you to take that message out of here. I want you to work for Susan Davis,

not just when the President comes to town but every day between now and November. I want you to work for Al Gore and the other Democrats. I want you to remind the people of California what it was like in 1992 and what it's like today. And I want you to say, "Look, we need somebody who will keep the prosperity going, who will spread it to more families and people who have been left behind, and who understands the future."

And remember, it's a big election; there are real differences and only the Democrats want you to know what they are.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:30 p.m. at the El Cortez Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Ms. Davis' husband, Steve; and George (Jorge) Barraza and Craig Barkacs, candidates for California's 51st and 52d Congressional Districts, respectively. Ms. Davis is a candidate for California's 49th Congressional District.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in San Diego

June 22, 2000

Let me say, first of all, Mike, you gave a wonderful talk, and you gave a wonderful toast. And I like it either way. *[Laughter]* And I want to thank you and Carol and all of you for the work you did to make this a success tonight. I'd like to thank California's first lady, Sharon Davis, for being here. I'd like to thank Representative Bob Filner and his wife, Jane, who are here. Thank you for being here. Former Representative and chief of staff to the Governor, Lynn Schenk, thank you for being here.

And I also would like to thank the leaders of the Barona and Viejas tribes for their support and for the example they're setting. We had a great talk around the table tonight about the differences among the tribes in terms of economic circumstances and potential in Indian country throughout America. And it's one of the great honors of my Presidency has been the opportunity I've had to spend more time with more people from the Native American tribes and the Tribal government than any President probably in history. I invited all the Tribal leaders to meet me at the White House, for the first time

since James Monroe was President in the 1820's, that happened. It was quite wonderful. So it's been a great thing.

I would like to thank Bertrand, the owner of Mr. A's Restaurant, for a wonderful dinner tonight. Was this great, or what? *[Applause]* When I used to do these back home and we didn't eat like this—*[laughter]*—I feel pretty great about it.

I'd like to thank Mayor Rendell, who I did—he was looking forward to a fairly peaceful retirement of a year or so, and then he was going to ascend to the Governorship of Pennsylvania, which I still hope he will do. So I told him I had this little part-time job I was interested in him doing. And he has part-timed himself all across America, exhausting himself, trying to make sure that we preserve the progress in this country and preserve the prosperity. And I'm very, very grateful to him. He's been a great leader for our party. And all these young people that work on these events, I'm grateful to them.

I'll tell you a story. I don't know about a joke, but I'll tell you a story. You gave the Irish blessing so—my people are from a place called Fermanagh. They were Irish Protestants living on the border. Fermanagh is a little village literally on the border of Northern Ireland and Ireland, in the west. And my mother was a Cassidy. So we found the Protestant Cassidys. We traced them all the way back to a farmhouse built in the 1750's. And I went to Ireland in '95; they actually gave me a watercolor of the farmhouse, which is the only—the oldest known residence of relatives of mine—at least, any relative that's willing to admit it still. *[Laughter]*

And you know I've had this remarkable love affair with Ireland, because I got the United States involved in the peace process, and it's worked out in a remarkable way. I went to Dublin in '95; we had 100,000 people in the street; it was really one of the great days of my life. I turned on the Christmas lights in Belfast, and there were 50,000 people there. It's just been unbelievable.

What happens, especially when you're not running anymore, you tend to get a little free with what you say. *[Laughter]* Sometimes you actually commit the sin of saying exactly what you think. *[Laughter]* I can say this because we've had a happy ending now.

[*Laughter*] You may remember, for a while we got the institutions of self-government up to Northern Ireland, and everybody is working along together, and then all of a sudden it all gets taken down because they can't agree on the decommissioning issue. And it was maddening. And all these people had been working for years, many of them a lot longer than I had though—that after we had actually ended the Irish civil war and we had got it all done, it was all going to pieces again.

And I said—not thinking about stereotyping the Irish, of which I am one—I said, this reminds me—I said these two sides in Northern Ireland remind me of two guys that are kind of drunk, and they decide they're going to quit drinking. And they walk out of the bar together, arm in arm, and right as they get to the swinging door they say, no, and they turn around and go back.

So I was blasted all over Ireland. "Clinton let us down. He's stereotyping the Irish." And I was really worried about it until about 3 days later I got in the mail a copy of a letter to the editor from the Irish Times saying, "I see all this criticism of President Clinton for comparing us, and all those things he said." And he said, "It is terrible what he said; I've been a drunk all my adult life, and I resent being compared to those people." [*Laughter*] So sometimes when you're uptight, you've just got to tell a joke and laugh it off and go on.

But anyway, I'm delighted to be here and I'm delighted that—I sort of thought there would come a time this year when I'd show up at one of these dinners and no one would be there. [*Laughter*] And so I'm very grateful to you. I'm grateful to the people of California, and I'm very grateful to the people of San Diego. I've had a special relationship with this community from the beginning. I love it here. My family and I have had a wonderful set of experiences here. We had a wonderful vacation here one year around—a springtime vacation. And I'm particularly glad that I came here tonight and somebody showed up. [*Laughter*]

I got a call last week from a very distinguished citizen of the world who said, "Well, Mr. President, for a lame duck, you're still quacking rather loudly." [*Laughter*] So that's what I'm trying to do.

I would like to just say a couple of things to follow up on what Mayor Rendell said. I thank you for coming here, and we'll do our best to invest the funds you have given us wisely. But we need your help in telling people why you feel this way. People ask me all the time, they come up to me and they say, "Who do you think is going to get elected?" And I always say, "I think the Vice President is going to win." I do. I said it a year and a half ago when he was 18 points behind in the polls.

Then they kind of say, "Do you think Hillary is going to win?" I say, "Of course"—I mean, what do you expect me to say? But I actually believe it. But let me say what I think the real issue is in all these Senate and the House and the President's race. And I do think we're going to win. But the issue is, what do the voters think the election is about? This is one of those deals—we've got a lot of trial lawyers in this room. Sometimes the answers people give depends upon the way the question is asked, or what you think the real question is. And this election—really, the outcome of this election is going to be determined, by and large, by what people think this election is about.

And I think if we can demonstrate, number one, that we've been working here for 8 years with a core set of ideas designed to give opportunity to every responsible citizen and to create a community in which any American can be a part; and that we've tried to be a force for peace and freedom and prosperity and decency around the world; and that what we need to do is to build on that, not undo it—if we can make that point, then the second point we need to make is that we have to decide, we need to make a conscious decision about what to do with our prosperity. I mean, sometimes I feel like a broken record, but I will say this over and over and over again. Anybody who is over 30 years old can remember at least one time in his or her life when you have made a whopping mistake, not because you were faced with adverse circumstances but because things were rocking along so well you thought there was no penalty to the failure to concentrate. Anybody who is over 30 years old can remember at least one time in your

personal life or in your work life when a mistake has been made because it seemed that there were no consequences to the failure to concentrate because everything was rolling along.

And if you really listen to the two sides, the other side really seems to be saying, "Look, we need to just take this thing while it's coming because nobody can mess up this economy if they try." And I don't believe that. I think we need to make a conscious decision as a people that we have an obligation, a solemn obligation to our children's generation, to use this magic moment to deal with the big issues out there, the big challenges, the big opportunities of this century.

Now, if you get that far, then you have to say, what are those challenges; what do you think they ought to do; and are there any real differences between the parties? And I have to tell you that I think it's obvious what we ought to be doing. We need to figure out how to keep this prosperity going and spread its benefits to people and places who have been left behind.

We need to figure out how to make people who have jobs better able to balance their responsibilities at work and their responsibilities at home—something America still has not done enough on. Child care, preschool, after-school, health care for the families that are working out there that don't have it yet. All of those things.

We need to figure out how to continue to grow the economy and do even better at preserving and improving the environment, and especially dealing with the problem of climate change. We've proved that we can get the crime rate down. We ought to commit ourselves to making this the safest big country in the world. We can do that in 5 years if we made up our mind to do it. We ought to commit ourselves to paying America's debt off. We're not running deficits anymore; we're running surpluses. I think it ought to be a national policy goal to pay off the public debt. That's what I believe.

Now, I have to tell you, that's a very controversial position among Democrats, because we also want to spend more money to educate people, to provide health care to poor people. But here's why I'm for that. If we keep paying the debt down, we'll keep

interest rates down. It'll be easier for people to borrow money. It will be easier to invest. There will be more jobs. There will be higher incomes. And we'll keep the expansion going along. And the best social program any government can provide is a good private sector jobs. You've got to have a growing economy first.

We wouldn't be here having this conversation. This election wouldn't even be about all this stuff. We're sitting here arguing about how to spend the surplus, and is it \$1- or \$2-trillion over the next 10 years?

If I had told you in '92, if I had to come to California and I said, "I want you to vote for me, and I'll get rid of this deficit"—we'd been running a deficit for 30 years, and we quadrupled the national debt in the last 12 years—"now vote for me, and I'll get rid of it. And before I'm gone we'll have three different surpluses, and we'll know that we can pay off our debt in the first decade of the 21st century." Do you know what you would have said? You would have said, "He seems like such a nice man, but he's slightly daft, and we better send him home." [Laughter]

But it happened. People ask me all the time, what magical new idea did we bring to Washington in the economic area? And I always say, in one word, arithmetic. That is, we stopped playing games with the numbers. We stopped promising people something we couldn't deliver. We said if we're going to spend the money, we've got to have the money.

And we made hard choices. I got rid of hundreds of programs so that we could double our investment in education while we were cutting the deficit. And those things had to be done.

Now, what's all this got to do with where we are? So here we are now. If you believe these big challenges ought to be faced, then you have to say, well, are there consequences to the decision of who gets to be President? Are there consequences to the decision who gets elected to the Senate, who gets elected to the Congress? And I would argue that there are big differences between these candidates, and if you'll listen very closely to the debate, the Democrats are a lot more interested in you knowing what the differences are than the Republicans are. Because they

know if you really understand the differences, two-thirds of the people agree with us.

For example, should we say, okay, now we have the surplus at \$2 trillion over 10 years, estimated, projected, over the next 10 years. So their policy is to spend over half of it on a tax cut, \$1.3 trillion, and then to partially privatize Social Security, which—and guarantee the benefits of everybody still in the system, which will cost about another \$800 billion. So there's \$2 billion there. And then to pay for "star wars" and school vouchers and some other promises, so that we'll be back into deficits sooner or later in the next decade if we get the whole \$2 trillion.

Our policy, as reflected in the Vice President's position, is we may not get the \$2 trillion. That great line from "Jerry McGuire"—"Show me the money!" The problem with all this tax cut stuff, it sounds great and most of you would be better off in the short run with their policy. But I emphasize, in the short run, because if we have a big tax cut with 4 percent unemployment, it will be perceived as inflationary; interest rates will go up more than they've already gone up; it will slow the economy; it will cut the profitability of your investments; and therefore, the projected surplus will not materialize, and we'll be right back in the deficit suit.

So we're put in a position of telling you things you may not want to hear, like the Vice President said the other day, why don't we just start by saying we're going to save 20 percent of this projected surplus, because \$400 billion of this projected surplus are taxes you're paying for Medicare. So let's just wall it off, use it to pay down the debt until we need it, and then Medicare will last a lot longer.

Why don't we have a tax cut, but less than—and a sizable one, but still less than half the one they propose, so we can focus on wealth creation for people that can't do it otherwise, help them establish their own savings account, child care, sending kids to college, long-term care when you've got an elderly or disabled relative who is sick, and then save some money to invest in our future—in education, in science and technology, in new environmental technologies,

in health care, and the things that will change our future?

Now, there's a huge difference. What do you propose to do with the surplus? What do you propose to do with this moment of prosperity? It will affect economic policy; it will affect social policy. What are the other differences?

Well, we think we ought to bend over backwards and let everybody participate. We think the people that served this food tonight, if they're working hard and obeying the law, have just as much right as we do to benefit from this new economy. That's what we think. And so we think we ought to raise the minimum wage; they don't. We think we also ought to have a tax cut for working people that have modest wages with children at home. We think that we ought to pass the Patients' Bill of Rights, and they don't. We think we ought to have a Medicare-based, broad-based prescription program for seniors so that people can get medicine that can't afford it today, and they don't.

If we were creating Medicare today, we'd never create Medicare without a drug program today. It was a doctor-and-hospital program in 1965 because that's what medicine was. Now anybody that lives to be 65 years old has got a life expectancy of 82. And if they take care of themselves and they have access to good health care, they could live longer.

In a few days, we'll have an announcement that the human genome project is essentially completed, its basic mapping. You will then see in the next couple of years this breathtaking explosion of discoveries about the pattern and genes that make you more likely to get certain kinds of cancer or Parkinson's or Alzheimer's, or become overweight, or have a heart attack, or whatever. You'll see all this stuff. And you will begin to see kind of individualized plans develop for little babies when the mothers bring them home from the hospital that will change the whole landscape of health care. And it wouldn't surprise me a bit to see children being born within the next 10 years in our country and other developed countries that are being born with a life expectancy of 90 years. That is going to change everything.

So if you're going to live that long, it seems to me that the society's obligation is for people not only to live as long but to live as well as possible. One thing the Congress did on the bipartisan fashion—and I applaud everybody who did, including the Republicans, and take the earnings limit off Social Security. We need to do that. You can't have—if a huge percentage of your population is over 65 and a bunch of them are healthy as can be and they want to work, you don't want to have an economic incentive for them not to work when you're going to have a ratio of people on Social Security to not—of only two to one.

So we have to think of all these things. Now, why am I for Al Gore for President? Not just on all these issues. I could go through—let me just talk about crime a minute. I want to talk about crime. I want to talk about welfare. We got a bipartisan welfare reform bill through, but I had to veto two bills. Why? Because I agreed with the Republicans that people who were able-bodied on welfare who could work should work, but what I did not agree with is that we should abandon the national guarantee of health care and nutrition to their children.

So we finally got a bill. And I said, we've got work requirements in here. This is not going to be a disincentive. But we've got to take care of these children. So I vetoed two bills, and we finally got one we agreed on. I signed it, and they were saying, "Well, maybe it was too weak." All I know is, since I became President, we've got the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years, and they're less than half the size they were in '93.

On the crime bill, the first time I ever did an event with Ed Rendell when he was mayor was on an anti-drug, anti-crime, anti-gang event. Ed and I were so dumb, we didn't know crime was a Republican issue; we thought it was an American issue. *[Laughter]* All this idea that it's a Republican issue is like that's what's the matter with Washington; it's all about words and stuff instead of what are you really producing.

So we had a crime program: put more cops in the streets, do more things to keep kids off the street and out of trouble, and take steps to get guns out of the hands of criminals and kids. It wasn't rocket science. Yes, the

improving economy helped the crime rate. Yes, the aging population in some places helped the crime rate. Yes, the sort of waning of the crack epidemic helped the crime rate. But put more police on the streets, giving the kids something positive to do, and doing more to take guns out of the hands of criminals and children also had something to do with it.

Now, I realize that it was a political risk. We lost a dozen Members of our caucus in the '94 election because they had the guts to vote for the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban, because the NRA convinced people we were going to come and take their guns away. A dozen gave up their careers so that your kids could be safer. And these people are still talking about—now they say if Governor Bush wins, they'll have an office in the White House. And figuratively, they will, because they've made their commitments, and they'll have to honor them.

But look here, not a single hunter has missed a day in the deer woods because of the Brady bill or the assault weapons ban. *[Laughter]* And when we banned those cop-killer bullets, they still haven't found the first deer wearing a Kevlar vest. *[Laughter]* I mean, there are no problems here. What is the deal here? I mean, what is this about? I mean, I can say it. One of the reasons that they dislike me so intensely is that I grew up in one of the all-time hunting cultures of the world.

But this is crazy. You can't have a society where you take no sensible steps to keep criminals and little children from having access to guns. So the Brady bill has kept a half million felons, fugitives, and stalkers from getting guns. We've got a 35-year low on gun crime.

So what do we want to do? Well, we want to close the gun show loophole. That means if somebody goes to a gun show, we think we ought to do a background check. We want child trigger locks on the guns. We want not to import large capacity ammunition clips which can be used by people in America to get around the assault weapons ban.

Now, there is still not anybody going to miss a day in the deer woods. All this rhetoric about gun control is crazy. You know, in America, we have a constitutional right to

travel, too. The Supreme Court says there is a constitutional right to travel. But if you leave here and you get in your car and you go home, you'll have seatbelts; you'll have a speed limit. If you've got a little baby, you'd have a child restraint law. And you don't ever hear anybody griping about car control, do you? Car control, it's a threat to the constitutional rights of travel. *[Laughter]* Car control is if I come get your car and put it in my garage. *[Laughter]* Otherwise, it's highway safety.

So there is a big difference between our two parties in this. And I think it's a huge issue. I'm glad we've got a lower crime rate, but this country is nowhere near as safe as it needs to be. And I don't think we ought to quit until we're the safest big country in the world. Just like I don't think we ought to quit paying down the debt until we're out of debt. And these are big ideas. You get the drift here. And we're different on these issues.

So the last thing I want to say is, I hope this election will be an honest, open debate where we posit the fact that the candidates for President and Senate and Congress are basically honorable people who intend to keep their commitments and talk about their differences and have an honest debate. I think if we do that, I think Al Gore will be elected President. I think that all these great candidates we've got in California, we've got a chance to pick up several House seats here. I think we'll win all of the ones we've got a chance to win because they're good candidates and because the voters will agree with us, because we've got a record that proves that in the areas where we're different we've gotten results, and because we've got new ideas.

And I just want to say one word about the Vice President. I think I probably know him better than anybody outside his family now. There are three reasons that I'd be for him if he weren't my Vice President, and I didn't feel obligated in a profound and wonderful sense. One is, I agree with the economic policy he's articulated. I don't think we ought to risk giving away the whole projected surplus on tax cuts and long-term spending commitments. I think it's a risky strategy, and it's not worth it, and you wouldn't run your

family business that way, and you wouldn't run your business that way. And we shouldn't run our Government that way. We worked a long time to turn this thing around, and we don't want to just squander it again.

Number two, I think he'll work harder to extend the benefits of this prosperity to people in places that aren't part of it now, and to help average families balance work and child rearing, open the doors of college to everybody.

Number three, I think he understands the future. This is a big deal. Al Gore was talking about global warming before most people even knew the two words went together. I'm talking years and years and years ago he was talking about it. Now, even the major oil companies admit that it's real. The first time we ever had lunch together he showed me this chart he's got about greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere and how much they've gone up. And in the 8 years we've been here in the White House, 7 of them were 7 of the 10 hottest years recorded since 1400.

Al Gore was talking about the Internet before other people in Congress. He's been falsely accused of claiming he created it. That's not true. That's like another one of those bum raps. Once somebody says something in the press, they just keep on playing it. It doesn't matter if it's not true anymore; it sort of acquires it.

What he said was that he introduced legislation which helped to create it, and it did create it as a phenomenon that went beyond a small private government research project. Do you know how many sites there were on the World Wide Web when I became President? Fifty. How many are there now, everyone? Fifty million? Fifty, and now 50 million. He understood that.

He understands that there is all these fabulous possibilities to close the digital divide and to do things that we haven't even imagined, but we also are going to have to work hard to protect our old-fashioned values. For example, if all of our health records and all of our financial records are on somebody's computer somewhere, I think that you ought to have some privacy protection. And there are some things I don't think other people ought to be able to get unless you say okay.

And somebody that understands all the competing the considerations, it would be a good thing to have a President that understood that.

So I think his economic policy is right. I think he'll do more to try to help everybody benefit from the things that are going on. And I think he really understands the future. And I think that's what you want.

So what I'd like to ask you to do is to go out and tell people who want to know why you came here tonight—not to hear me tell Irish jokes—that, well, California is a better place than it was 8 years ago. They had some ideas, and they turned out to be pretty good, that you agree with Gore's economic policy and you think we ought to spread the benefits to more people and build one American community. And you want somebody who understands the future and can lead us there.

And on the critical issues, there really are differences between the parties, and it's important that they be clarified and uplifted. But if the people believe that this election is about whether we can build the future of our dreams for our children, we'll be just fine.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:37 p.m. in Dining Room B at Mr. A's Restaurant. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Mike and Carol Thorsness; Edward G. Rendell, general chair, Democratic National Committee; Bertrand Hug, owner, Mr. A's Restaurant; and Gov. George W. Bush of Texas. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

**Remarks to the United States
Olympic Training Center
Community in Chula Vista,
California**

June 23, 2000

Thank you very much. Thank you, Deena, for the wonderful introduction and for the way you represent our country—and for the little local reference to Arkansas, I liked that. [Laughter]

Thank you, Bill Hybl, for the work you do with the Olympic Committee. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Pat Milkovich for the wonderful tour of the train-

ing center today. We had a great time, and I thank you so much.

I want to thank Representative Bob Filner, the Congressman from this district for being with me today and for his support. Someone just thanked him on the way for being against having all that cargo noise coming over here and interrupting your training center. So, I figure he'll take a lot of heat for that position. So, somebody who likes it might as well clap. [Laughter]

I want to thank the Venita Vista High School Marching Band for playing; let's give them a hand, they're great. [Applause] Some of their members have been selected to perform at the opening ceremonies in Sydney, and I know they'll have a good time. I'd like to thank Mayor Morton from Chula Vista and the Chula Vista council members who are here and the county officials who are here. And Representative Susan Davis, the candidate for Congress. Thank you for coming. I'm glad to see all of you here.

Most of all, I'd like to thank the athletes and the coaches and the trainers that gave me a tour around this magnificent facility today. I had a great time. And I realize that most of these things I can't do anymore—[laughter]—but I really had a great time.

Deena talked about perseverance and hard work, but I want to tell you a little something about her. She was too humble to mention her own experience with cross country championships in Portugal this year. About 100 yards into the race her throat closed up, and she couldn't breathe. After 5 kilometers, she blacked out and fell. It turned out a bee had flown into her mouth and stung her in the throat.

But she got up and kept going, and thanks to her, the women's team still left Portugal with a medal. She gave new meaning to the term "making a beeline." Give her a hand, she was great. [Applause]

One of the real highlights of our White House years for Hillary, Chelsea, and me has been the chance to be a part of the Olympic experience, cheering on our teams from Lillehammer to Atlanta to Nagano and now to Sydney, where at least I know my daughter is going. My wife is in a competition of her own, and I am informed that my services may

be needed elsewhere; but our daughter informed us that she would be in Sydney to cheer the teams on.

I am so glad to have this chance to see all the work that you're doing to prepare for the games here. You know, just moments before he won one of his gold medals, the legendary Jesse Owens said, "a lifetime of training for just 10 seconds." In the magic of the Olympic moment, it may be easy for those of us who aren't part of it, except as spectators, to lose sight of all that had to be done before. The years and years of getting up before the Sun, the time away from your loved ones, the hard work, the sacrifice, and something that's often overlooked—the pain.

So on behalf of all the people of this country. I'd like to just say more than anything else, I wanted to come here to say to these team members and those who want to make the Olympic teams, we appreciate you; we thank you; and we are very, very proud of you.

I have thought a lot, especially in the Olympic season, about why the Olympics mean so much to people all over the world, and especially why the American people get so completely caught up in them, why they capture our imagination and our hearts. Obviously, we love athletics. And we are highly competitive people, as that little in-your-face rap that Deena gave us showed about the American team.

But I think there's even more to it than the love of competition and athletics. I think people like the Olympics, in large measure, because the Olympics work pretty much the way we think life ought to work; the way we think the world ought to work: everybody gets an opportunity to play—and regardless of race or station in life—and increasingly, thank goodness, regardless of gender. People are valued based on their performance and their effort, not their posturing. People get a chance to do their best, and also to bring out the best in one another. And everybody, including those that don't win medals, is better off for having tried, in giving his or her best. You win by playing by the rules and by doing it well.

I think we like the Olympics because we all think the world ought to work that way. And we know if other forms of human en-

deavor worked that way, we'd be better off. One of the reasons I ran for President 8 years ago is that I thought that Washington ought to work more like that. I thought it ought to be more about production and less about posturing. And it's tough for people in politics, because they know that if they produce, they may not get on the evening news. But if they posture, they can get there.

And so I hope part of what will happen in this, is that the Olympic spirit will catch up in Washington and will actually produce some things: medicine for our seniors on Medicare and a Patients' Bill of Rights and an increase in the minimum wage; a lot of other things we could be doing that we could actually reach agreement on across party lines, even though it may cost everybody a few seconds on the evening news.

The rules of the game there are too often, I've got an idea; you've got an idea; let's fight [*Laughter*] And you give us all a good sober reminder that in the end, when it's all said and done, we're gong to be judged not by what we said but by what we've done. And I thank you for that.

Now, let me just say, this day is special for a lot of reasons. It's Olympic Day: on this day more than 100 years ago, the modern Olympic games were founded. It was also 100 years ago this summer that women were first allowed to compete in the Olympic games, and they did, all 11 of them. [*Laughter*] This year more than 4,000 women will compete in the Olympic games—the largest number ever.

Let me say a couple of other things about this day. On this day 60 years ago one of the greatest Olympians of all time was born: Wilma Rudolph. She won her first medal the last time the Olympics were held in Australia, in 1956. And finally, today is special because it's also on this day 28 years ago that Title IX became the law of the land.

Now, it's interesting that all this stuff happened on this day. But Title IX has really enabled America to live up to the Olympic spirit to give everybody a chance, to give everybody a chance to play by the rules, everybody a chance to live up to his and her God-given abilities.

Before Title IX, there were 300,000 girls in high school sports. Today, there are more

than 2 million. It's not a coincidence that in Atlanta, the first generation of women to grow up under Title IX—literally to have their whole lives in Title IX—went on to win the gold medal in soccer, the gold medal in softball, the gold medal in gymnastics, and the gold medal in basketball. It works.

Believe it or not, I found out not long ago that Title IX's requirement for equal opportunity in sports and in education does not apply to the education and training programs run by the Federal Government itself. So on this anniversary of Title IX, I am actually signing an Executive order that applies Title IX to the Federal Government's programs and prohibits discrimination of any kind in federally conducted education and training programs.

Let me just say one other thing about the importance of broadening opportunities here. I would like to ask all of you who are presently athletes or who have been or who are otherwise involved in this Olympic movement to continue to share your gifts, not only on the field of competition but in the playing field of life, and especially with our young people—and with those whose job it is to raise them well.

Let me just give you one example of something that really concerns me. Over the last 20 years, too many of our schools have abandoned their music, their arts, and their psychological education programs. You may have noticed that last week I went to New York City to be on the "Today Show" to talk about the VH1 music and school program, where they worked so hard to get instruments back into schools so schools can start their school music programs again.

There is so much evidence that a lot of young people learn better if they have access early to music and arts programs. But it's also really troubling to me that so many schools have just completely abandoned physical education programs for all kids, while maintaining team sports.

Now, a lot of the athletes behind me may be going to the Olympics in sports for which there was no competition in their schools. And they wouldn't necessarily have been football or basketball players, or even soccer players, if their schools had competitive soccer.

Listen to this. The percentage of high school students in daily physical education has declined more than 30 percent in the last 10 years. Today, fewer than one in three students are enrolled in phys-ed every day. Meanwhile, the percentage of young people who are overweight has doubled in the same time period. The two things are closely related. And we know that it has an effect on learning, on self-image, on self-esteem, on a sense of what you can do.

Today I'm directing our Secretary of Education, Dick Riley, and Donna Shalala, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to work with the U.S. Olympic Committee, our physical fitness council, and others to try to find ways to encourage more young people to get fit and stay fit. And I'm asking Congress to establish a foundation that will leverage the energy, creativity, and resources of the private sector in furthering the mission of the President's Council on Physical Fitness, to help every young people in America to live an active, safe, and healthy life.

I hope you'll help us do that. We need to remember that not every 6- or 8- or 10-year-old can be on the football team or on a basketball team, or even on a soccer team, and all of our kids need access to healthy lifestyles, good exercise, and basic good athletic habits. We need your help in achieving that goal.

Finally, let me say I'd give anything to be in Sydney. I thank you for your dedication, your courage, for reaching deep inside, for giving your heart and soul to this. And I want you to win all the medals you can, just like Deena said. But I want you to realize that by what you have accomplished already, and by the way you have done it, you have already made your country very proud.

You carry more than our flag to Sydney. You carry the spirit of our country, our hopes, our dreams, our prayers. And all of us will be with you all the way.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:55 a.m. on the terrace at the U.S. Olympic Training Center Visitors Center. In his remarks, he referred to athlete Deena Drossin, who introduced the President; Bill Hybil, president, U.S. Olympic Committee; Pat Milkovich, director, U.S. Olympic Training Center; Mayor Shirley A. Horton of Chula Vista;

State Assemblywoman Susan Davis, a candidate for California's 49th Congressional District. The President also referred to Title IX—Prohibition of Sex Discrimination, part of Public Law 92–318, the Education Amendments of 1972.

**Executive Order 13160—
Nondiscrimination on the Basis of
Race, Sex, Color, National Origin,
Disability, Religion, Age, Sexual
Orientation, and Status as a Parent in
Federally Conducted Education and
Training Programs**

June 23, 2000

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including sections 921–932 of title 20, United States Code; section 2164 of title 10, United States Code; section 2001 *et seq.*, of title 25, United States Code; section 7301 of title 5, United States Code; and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and to achieve equal opportunity in Federally conducted education and training programs and activities, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Statement of policy on education programs and activities conducted by executive departments and agencies.*

1–101. The Federal Government must hold itself to at least the same principles of nondiscrimination in educational opportunities as it applies to the education programs and activities of State and local governments, and to private institutions receiving Federal financial assistance. Existing laws and regulations prohibit certain forms of discrimination in Federally conducted education and training programs and activities—including discrimination against people with disabilities, prohibited by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. 701 *et seq.*, as amended, employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, or religion, prohibited by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000e–17, as amended, discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, or religion in educational programs receiving Federal assistance, under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d, and sex-based discrimination

in education programs receiving Federal assistance under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. 1681 *et seq.* Through this Executive Order, discrimination on the basis of race, sex, color, national origin, disability, religion, age, sexual orientation, and status as a parent will be prohibited in Federally conducted education and training programs and activities.

1–102. No individual, on the basis of race, sex, color, national origin, disability, religion, age, sexual orientation, or status as a parent, shall be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination in, a Federally conducted education or training program or activity.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

2–201. “Federally conducted education and training programs and activities” includes programs and activities conducted, operated, or undertaken by an executive department or agency.

2–202. “Education and training programs and activities” include, but are not limited to, formal schools, extracurricular activities, academic programs, occupational training, scholarships and fellowships, student internships, training for industry members, summer enrichment camps, and teacher training programs.

2–203. The Attorney General is authorized to make a final determination as to whether a program falls within the scope of education and training programs and activities covered by this order, under subsection 2–202, or is excluded from coverage, under section 3.

2–204. “Military education or training programs” are those education and training programs conducted by the Department of Defense or, where the Coast Guard is concerned, the Department of Transportation, for the primary purpose of educating or training members of the armed forces or meeting a statutory requirement to educate or train Federal, State, or local civilian law enforcement officials pursuant to 10 U.S.C. Chapter 18.

2–205. “Armed Forces” means the Armed Forces of the United States.

2–206. “Status as a parent” refers to the status of an individual who, with respect to an individual who is under the age of 18 or who is 18 or older but is incapable of self-

care because of a physical or mental disability, is:

- (a) a biological parent;
- (b) an adoptive parent;
- (c) a foster parent;
- (d) a stepparent;
- (e) a custodian of a legal ward;
- (f) in loco parentis over such an individual; or
- (g) actively seeking legal custody or adoption of such an individual.

Sec. 3. Exemption from coverage.

3-301. This order does not apply to members of the armed forces, military education or training programs, or authorized intelligence activities. Members of the armed forces, including students at military academies, will continue to be covered by regulations that currently bar specified forms of discrimination that are now enforced by the Department of Defense and the individual service branches. The Department of Defense shall develop procedures to protect the rights of and to provide redress to civilians not otherwise protected by existing Federal law from discrimination on the basis of race, sex, color, national origin, disability, religion, age, sexual orientation, or status as a parent and who participate in military education or training programs or activities conducted by the Department of Defense.

3-302. This order does not apply to, affect, interfere with, or modify the operation of any otherwise lawful affirmative action plan or program.

3-303. An individual shall not be deemed subjected to discrimination by reason of his or her exclusion from the benefits of a program established consistent with federal law or limited by Federal law to individuals of a particular race, sex, color, disability, national origin, age, religion, sexual orientation, or status as a parent different from his or her own.

3-304. This order does not apply to ceremonial or similar education or training programs or activities of schools conducted by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, that are culturally relevant to the children represented in the school. "Culturally relevant" refers to any class, program, or activity that is fundamental to a tribe's cul-

ture, customs, traditions, heritage, or religion.

3-305. This order does not apply to (a) selections based on national origin of foreign nationals to participate in covered education or training programs, if such programs primarily concern national security or foreign policy matters; or (b) selections or other decisions regarding participation in covered education or training programs made by entities outside the executive branch. It shall be the policy of the executive branch that education or training programs or activities shall not be available to entities that select persons for participation in violation of Federal or State law.

3-306. The prohibition on discrimination on the basis of age provided in this order does not apply to age-based admissions of participants to education or training programs, if such programs have traditionally been age-specific or must be age-limited for reasons related to health or national security.

Sec. 4. Administrative enforcement.

4-401. Any person who believes himself or herself to be aggrieved by a violation of this order or its implementing regulations, rules, policies, or guidance may, personally or through a representative, file a written complaint with the agency that such person believes is in violation of this order or its implementing regulations, rules, policies, or guidance. Pursuant to procedures to be established by the Attorney General, each executive department or agency shall conduct an investigation of any complaint by one of its employees alleging a violation of this Executive Order.

4-402. (a) If the office within an executive department or agency that is designated to investigate complaints for violations of this order or its implementing rules, regulations, policies, or guidance concludes that an employee has not complied with this order or any of its implementing rules, regulations, policies, or guidance, such office shall complete a report and refer a copy of the report and any relevant findings or supporting evidence to an appropriate agency official. The appropriate agency official shall review such material and determine what, if any, disciplinary action is appropriate.

(b) In addition, the designated investigating office may provide appropriate agency officials with a recommendation for any corrective and/or remedial action. The appropriate officials shall consider such recommendation and implement corrective and/or remedial action by the agency, when appropriate. Nothing in this order authorizes monetary relief to the complainant as a form of remedial or corrective action by an executive department or agency.

4-403. Any action to discipline an employee who violates this order or its implementing rules, regulations, policies, or guidance, including removal from employment, where appropriate, shall be taken in compliance with otherwise applicable procedures, including the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, Public Law No. 95-454, 92 Stat. 1111.

Sec. 5. Implementation and Agency Responsibilities.

5-501. The Attorney General shall publish in the *Federal Register* such rules, regulations, policies, or guidance, as the Attorney General deems appropriate, to be followed by all executive departments and agencies. The Attorney General shall address:

- a. which programs and activities fall within the scope of education and training programs and activities covered by this order, under subsection 2-202, or excluded from coverage, under section 3 of this order;
- b. examples of discriminatory conduct;
- c. applicable legal principles;
- d. enforcement procedures with respect to complaints against employees;
- e. remedies;
- f. requirements for agency annual and tri-annual reports as set forth in section 6 of this order; and
- g. such other matters as deemed appropriate.

5-502. Within 90 days of the publication of final rules, regulations, policies, or guidance by the Attorney General, each executive department and agency shall establish a procedure to receive and address complaints regarding its Federally conducted education and training programs and activities. Each executive department and agency shall take all necessary steps to effectuate any subsequent rules, regulations, policies, or guidance

issued by the Attorney General within 90 days of issuance.

5-503. The head of each executive department and agency shall be responsible for ensuring compliance within this order.

5-504. Each executive department and agency shall cooperate with the Attorney General and provide such information and assistance as the Attorney General may require in the performance of the Attorney General's functions under this order.

5-505. Upon request and to the extent practicable, the Attorney General shall provide technical advice and assistance to executive departments and agencies to assist in full compliance with this order.

Sec. 6. Reporting Requirements.

6-601. Consistent with the regulations, rules, policies, or guidance issued by the Attorney General, each executive department and agency shall submit to the Attorney General a report that summarizes the number and nature of complaints filed with the agency and the disposition of such complaints. For the first 3 years after the date of this order, such reports shall be submitted annually within 90 days of the end of the preceding year's activities. Subsequent reports shall be submitted every 3 years and within 90 days of the end of each 3-year period.

Sec. 7. General Provisions.

7-701. Nothing in this order shall limit the authority of the Attorney General to provide for the coordinated enforcement of non-discrimination requirements in Federal assistance programs under Executive Order 12250.

Sec. 8. Judicial Review.

8-801. This order is not intended, and should not be construed, to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or its employees. This order is not intended, however, to preclude judicial review of final decisions in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 701, *et seq.*

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 23, 2000.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:47 p.m., June 26, 2000]

NOTE: This Executive order will be published in the *Federal Register* on June 27.

Memorandum on Enhancing Efforts To Promote the Health of Our Young People Through Physical Activity and Participation in Sports

June 23, 2000

Memorandum for the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Education

Subject: Enhancing Efforts to Promote the Health of Our Young People Through Physical Activity and Participation in Sports

Physical activity and participation in sports are central to the overall health and well-being of children and adults. Adolescence is an especially important time to establish the habit of participation in daily physical activity. Sports and physical activity can introduce young people to skills such as teamwork, self-discipline, and sportsmanship. Lack of recreational activity, on the other hand, may contribute to making young people more vulnerable to gangs, drugs, or violence. Studies consistently show that adolescents who engage in regular physical activity have higher self-esteem and lower anxiety and stress. Unfortunately, daily enrollment in high school physical education classes dropped from 42 percent to 29 percent between 1991 and 1999 and about 14 percent of young people ages 12–21 report no recent physical activity at all. Over the past 30 years, the percentage of young people who are overweight has more than doubled.

The extent of this problem should not be underestimated. Last year, for example, the United States spent over \$68 billion, or 6 percent of the Nation's health care expenditures, on direct health care costs related to obesity. According to the landmark 1996 Surgeon General's Report on Physical Activity and Health, inactivity and poor diet contribute to nearly 300,000 deaths in the United States annually. In conjunction with the recent National Nutrition Summit hosted by my Ad-

ministration—the first in over three decades—I released revised Dietary Guidelines for Americans, including a new guideline recommending regular physical activity.

My Administration has an ongoing multi-pronged effort to promote physical activity and fitness. The President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports Participation continues to play an important role in promoting physical fitness and sports participation nationwide. A key part of the Council's work is the President's Challenge Youth Physical Fitness Awards Program, which offers awards for participation and excellence in a set of physical fitness assessments to encourage 2.9 million students to improve and maintain physical fitness. The Department of Health and Human Services' National Youth Sports Program collaborates with participating colleges to provide summer sports programs in college environments to youth living in areas of urban and rural poverty. Currently, over 70,000 children at over 200 colleges and universities through this program can improve their physical fitness and health habits while becoming acquainted with post-secondary educational opportunities.

The Department of Education also promotes physical activity and health in schools. My Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization proposal includes "Life-long Physical Activity" discretionary grants as part of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. Building on current demonstration projects by the Centers for Disease Control, this initiative would authorize funding for sites to implement programs that promote lifelong physical activity and health awareness during and after school by linking physical education with health education.

These efforts, and many similar public and private initiatives around the country, are encouraging. We must now build on this groundwork by developing additional strategies for promoting physical fitness and participation in sports, which are essential to improving individual and community health.

Therefore, I direct you to identify and report back to me within 90 days on strategies to promote better health for our Nation's youth through physical activity and fitness, including:

1. Promoting the renewal of physical education in our schools, as well as the expansion of after-school programs that offer physical activities and sports in addition to enhanced academics and cultural activities;
2. Encouraging participation by private sector partners in raising the level of physical activity and fitness among our youth; and
3. Promoting greater coordination of existing public and private resources that encourages physical activity and sports.

In developing these strategies, you shall work with the U.S. Olympic Committee, and other private and nongovernmental sports organizations, as appropriate.

By identifying effective new steps and strengthening public-private partnerships, we will advance our efforts to prepare the Nation's young people for lifelong physical fitness.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this memorandum.

Statement on House of Representatives Action on the Tobacco Settlement Lawsuit

June 23, 2000

I am pleased today that the House of Representatives voted decisively to support the interests of the American people over those of the special interests. This action will help support the Justice Department's litigation to recover billions of dollars in tobacco-related health costs. I commend the bipartisan efforts led by Representatives Waxman, Evans, Meehan, Hansen, Ganske, and others who worked tirelessly to ensure that justice is carried out.

Proclamation 7324—50th Anniversary of the Korean War and National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day, 2000

June 23, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Fifty years ago, on June 25, 1950, armed forces from North Korea shattered the peace in the Land of the Morning Calm as they crossed the 38th Parallel and launched an invasion of South Korea. The communist forces advanced rapidly and, at the outset, appeared close to easy victory. President Truman, recognizing the threat to our South Korean allies and their democracy, responded swiftly and decisively. Through the United Nations Security Council, he marshaled international opposition to the invasion and, on June 27, 1950, committed the first U.S. forces to combat in South Korea.

On some of the world's harshest terrain, through the scorching heat of summer and the numbing cold of winter, American troops fought with steely determination and uncommon courage. As they gained ground, pushing the North Koreans back toward the 38th parallel, American families began to hope that our troops would be home by Christmas. But in November, at the Yalu River in North Korean territory, American forces encountered a new and daunting antagonist: Chinese forces had joined their North Korean allies, and the tide of battle turned once again.

Through months of attack and counter-attack, falling back and regaining ground, U.S. troops and our allies refused to succumb to enemy forces. The war dragged into a bloody stalemate and long, bitter talks ensued. Finally, negotiators signed an armistice agreement at Panmunjom on July 27, 1953. North Korea withdrew across the 38th parallel, and the Republic of South Korea regained its status as a free, democratic nation. For the first time in history, a world organization of nations had taken up arms to oppose aggression and, thanks largely to the valor, skill, and perseverance of almost 2,000,000 Americans, had succeeded.

In later years, the Korean War would sometimes be called “the Forgotten War.” But we have not forgotten. We pay honor to the courage of our veterans who fought in Korea and to the thousands who died there or whose fate is still unknown. We recall the grief of their families and the gratitude of the people of South Korea. We remember that, in the Korean War, our soldiers’ brave stand against communism laid the foundations of peace and freedom that so many nations enjoy today.

Over the next 3-½ years, Americans will gather to observe the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and honor our veterans. The Secretary of Defense will help coordinate many of these events and will develop commemorative and educational materials to help inform the American public about our veterans’ many contributions and sacrifices.

The Congress, by Public Law 106–195, has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of the 50th anniversary of the Korean War, and by Public Law 104–19 (36 U.S.C. 127), the Congress has designated July 27, 2000, as “National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day” and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of that day.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby urge all Americans to observe the 50th Anniversary of the Korean War and do hereby proclaim July 27, 2000, as National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day. I call upon all Americans to observe these periods with appropriate ceremonies and activities that honor and give thanks to our distinguished Korean War veterans. I also ask Federal departments and agencies and interested groups, organizations, and individuals to fly the flag of the United States at half-staff on July 27, 2000, in memory of the Americans who died as a result of their service in Korea.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-third day of June, in the year of our Lord two thousand, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-fourth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:47 p.m., June 26, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on June 27.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President’s public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

June 17

In the morning, the President returned to Washington, DC, from Chappaqua, NY.

June 19

In the morning, the President traveled to Houston, TX, and in the afternoon, he traveled to Austin, TX.

In the evening, the President returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to appoint LeRoy F. Saunders as a member of the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

The President announced his intention to appoint Joan Bennett Kennedy to the President’s Advisory Committee on the Arts of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

June 20

In the morning, the President met with King Mohamed VI of Morocco in the Oval Office, and then in the Cabinet Room.

In the afternoon, the President met with the Dalai Lama in the National Security Adviser’s Office concerning Tibet.

The President announced his intention to appoint Carolyn Brackett as a member of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

June 21

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Fayetteville, AR, and in the afternoon, he returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to reappoint John A. Calhoun and Larry

EchoHawk as members of the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

June 22

In the morning, the President traveled to Phoenix, AZ, and in the afternoon, he traveled to San Diego, CA.

The President announced his intention to appoint Kathleen Waldron Gershman to the President's Advisory Committee on the Arts of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The President announced his intention to appoint Charles H. Cole to the Advisory Committee to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

June 23

In the morning, the President traveled to Chula Vista, CA, and in the afternoon, he traveled to Los Angeles, CA.

The President announced his intention to appoint Deidre A. Lee as a member of the Federal Prison Industries Corporation.

The President declared a major disaster in Wisconsin and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe storms, tornadoes, and flooding on May 26 and continuing.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released June 19

Statement by the Press Secretary on the Supreme Court decision on the Massachusetts law barring State business with companies doing business with Burma

Released June 20

Statement by the Press Secretary: Meeting With the Dalai Lama

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Released June 21

Statement by the Press Secretary on an initiative to protect privacy on the Internet

Statement by the Press Secretary on new safeguards for Internet users

Released June 22

Statement by the Press Secretary on the Independent Counsel's press release on the travel office report

Released June 23

Announcement of nominations for the Superior Court of the District of Columbia

Acts Approved by the President

Approved June 20

H.R. 1953 / Public Law 106-216

To authorize leases for terms not to exceed 99 years on land held in trust for the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians and the Guidiville Band of Pomo Indians of the Guidiville Indian Rancheria

H.R. 2484 / Public Law 106-217

To provide that land which is owned by the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota but which is not held in trust by the United States for the Community may be leased or transferred by the Community without further approval by the United States

H.R. 3639 / Public Law 106–218

To designate the Federal building located at 2201 C Street, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, currently headquarters for the Department of State, as the “Harry S Truman Federal Building”

H.R. 4542 / Public Law 106–219

To designate the Washington Opera in Washington, D.C., as the National Opera

S. 291 / Public Law 106–220

Carlsbad Irrigation Project Acquired Land Transfer Act

S. 356 / Public Law 106–221

Wellton-Mohawk Transfer Act

S. 777 / Public Law 106–222

Freedom to E-File Act

S. 2722 / Public Law 106–223

To authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to Ed W. Freeman, James K. Okubo, and Andrew J. Smith

H.R. 2559 / Public Law 106–224

Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000

H.R. 3642 / Public Law 106–225

To authorize the President to award posthumously a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world, and for other purposes